

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)

VOL. II.

JULY, 1937.

No. 3

THE GREAT CURRENTS OF EASTERN SPIRITUALITY¹

EDITOR'S NOTE—We are publishing this translation of Father Hausherr's *Les Grands Courants de la Spiritualité Orientale* from *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, No. 1—11 (Rome, 1935) with the kind permission both of the editor of the periodical and of the author of the article.

We intend by publishing this article to give our readers a good introduction to the spirituality of the Christian East. We hope in future numbers of the E.C.Q. to publish articles dealing in detail with some of the teachers of the spiritual life mentioned herein.

PERE M. JUGIE writes very truly, in the introduction to the treatise on grace among the Orthodox: "Multam ad praesentem tractatum pertinentia vel in operibus nondum editis delitescent, vel ex litteratura ascetica, mystica, et homiletica etiam edita longo cum labore quaerenda essent, colligenda, logice ordinanda. Unde de praesenti materia novitatum explorandarum latum patere campum theologiae orientalis studiosis denuntiamus."² It would therefore be somewhat rash to wish to write at the present time a history of Eastern spirituality:³ ascetical and mystical studies have been too much neglected for some centuries. Even when not actually suspicious of learning, ascetics are at least not interested in theory; and pure theorists hardly go in for spiritual reading. What could be more unpleasant than to hear a perpetual preaching of the most austere and extravagant virtues: abnegation, mortification, detachment, flight from the world and from oneself! Remember, too, that boredom originally

¹Lecture given at the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, March 11th, 1934. We give it as it was delivered, with the minimum of reference notes, in the hope that it may be of some use.

²*Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium*, II, 725.

³Since these lines were written, M. E. Mercier's book, *La Spiritualité Byzantine*, Paris, 1933, has come out. But G. Bardy already assures us (*Vie Spirituelle*, March 1st, 1934, p. 188) that those who would hope to find in it a history of Byzantine spirituality "would be deeply disappointed." As regards the title, logicians would say: *fallacia in verbo*; and for the work itself, too often, *ignoratio elenchi*.

sprang from uniformity and that uniformity seems to be usual with spiritual writers, so much do they repeat, copy and crib, without even adding the attraction of a personal and original style to thoughts expressed hundreds of times before.

"*Monasticum est, non legitur*" seems to have been for too long the device of scholars; and then, *graecum est, syriacum est, armeniacum, russicum . . . est*. That is why the field remains largely open to investigation. And yet what human activity should more awaken our curiosity than the efforts of the best amongst our fellow human beings to reach God? Truly, when one has overcome the repugnance of beginning, when one has managed to perceive, through those dry pages, the beatings of the greatest of all loves; above all when, by the grace of God, one feels attuned to the hearts and souls of those ascetics—one ends by finding an unequalled charm in intercourse with them, in spite of the poverty of their style and the tediousness of their everlasting repetitions.

There are, nevertheless, many scholars who would willingly study Byzantine spirituality,¹ even though only because, of all the branches of Byzantism, it is that which would offer them the most discoveries. But Eastern ascetical and mystical literature gives them the impression of an unknown forest for the exploration of which there are neither paths nor compass. To venture in such regions is to risk getting lost, or finding oneself, after a painful walk, back at the starting point. In the West, we have carefully—too carefully—distinguished between different schools of spirituality, according to Religious Orders, for instance, which is very convenient, if somewhat artificial—or according to nations, which is even more artificial but always convenient. In the East, there are no Religious Orders, and, if nations differ, at least nationalism has not invaded spiritual teaching; the greatest spiritual writers for the Syrians, as for the Armenians and Russians, have always been, and still are, Greeks. We cannot therefore carry over to the East our too material principles for distinguishing between schools. And yet, unless we deny evolution, all diversity, all shades of difference in a teaching which spreads over eighteen centuries and three continents, we must perforce look for a principle whereby to differentiate.

History without events—a history of ideas without innovations or discussions—is just an absence of history. Where can one find that distinguishing criterion? Eliminating external circumstances, only the intrinsic character of the doctrines remains. Being a practical subject, spirituality may differ both in the end proposed and in the means suggested

¹ Several are already doing so, but more from the literary than the spiritual point of view.

to reach that end. But is not the end the same for all? Assuredly, in the last analysis. Nevertheless, it can appear under different aspects and the reason for this diversity will be found in the variety of psychological premises. According to the conception one has of human nature, one will form a particular concept of human perfection. There, it seems, is a safe guiding line. Unfortunately, many spiritual writers do not trouble to enlighten us as to their anthropology, even if they themselves realise what it is. We would therefore have to guess at it—and to do so, would mean deducing their logical and historical, often unconscious premises, from their explicit sayings. No easy task! However, our first distinguishing principle will be the particular form given by different authors to the aim of the spiritual life. Hence the great divisions in spirituality. Secondly, the diversity of the means assigned would enable us to point out some subdivisions in the Schools thus determined.

I.

PRIMITIVE SPIRITUALITY.

Spirituality is practical knowledge. One may add that practice preceded knowledge. There is no organised branch of learning without a philosophy. So long, therefore, as there were no available philosophers to attempt to cast Christian revelation into the mould of a system, Christians believed and lived their faith in the simplicity of obedience to evangelical tradition alone. The duration of this period differed according to regions. In Greek-speaking countries, this could hardly produce many spiritual writers. Hellenism so filled minds with philosophy that by the middle of the second century we find Justin "the Philosopher"; and soon after, speculative theology began with Clement of Alexandria. However short this period may have been—barely a century—it has left us enough documents to discern clearly the great lines of primitive spirituality. Above all, and at the centre of all: Christ, then union with Christ through the Church, His Mystical Body. Ignatius, Polycarp, Clement of Rome, the Didachus, were all in agreement on those points. And they agreed also in deducing from this the necessity of fraternal charity, as a sign of belonging to Christ through the Church. Further, the need of simplicity was insisted on, *i.e.*, "the uprightness of a simple and sturdy Christian who has given himself to God with all his heart and mind."¹ As for mystical gifts, they

¹ J. Lebreton in the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* of M. Viller, art: "Apostoliques" (Fathers).

were plentiful, but they were not given as a proof of perfection. For St. Ignatius wrote : " As for me, though I am the prisoner of Christ and can contemplate heavenly things and the angelical hierarchy, the host of principalities, things visible and invisible, I am not thereby yet a true disciple."¹ The true disciple of Christ is he who, like his Master, knows how to love to the end, to the laying down of life : perfection is one with martyrdom or with the charity that makes martyrdom desirable and bearable. It is from this charity, through self-sacrifice, that all other virtues spring, especially virginity, which was soon to be considered as a substitute for martyrdom ; but even virginity only has value if it remains in humility and submission to the Church. Is it not by obedience that Christ humbled Himself to the death of the Cross ?

Those, then, are the very simple thoughts which inspired the incomparable words of St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Romans.² Reading over that unsurpassed passage, one could easily regret that the blessed time of that primitive simplicity ended so soon with the Alexandrians coming on the scene. Still, we must note—and one could not do so too insistently—that St. Irenaeus is the direct and faithful heir of the Apostolic Fathers. That great enemy of pseudo-gnosis has not yet received the attention he deserves from historians of spirituality.³ If he were studied more deeply from that point of view, perhaps we would resolutely give up seeing in Clement of Alexandria the " Father of Christian mysticism," when he was at most only the introducer of speculation into Christianity. Perfection for St. Irenaeus was διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης πλησιόν γενέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ—partaking of God's intimate life through charity.⁴ To which nothing is more opposed than " occasione scientiae opiniari seipsio esse perfectos"—to consider oneself perfect because one possesses gnosis.⁵ That is pride, and therefore a falling from charity. To this claim of a purely mental mysticism, Irenaeus opposed a much fuller and deeper conception, both more human and more worthy of God. All that is, is in God. Contact between man and God is therefore not brought about only by an intellectual act, but by the immersion of the whole soul in God and by God penetrating the whole soul. Not only an act of

¹ Ep. ad Trall. 5, 2 ; PG. 5, 781 seq.

² Ep. ad Rom. 5 ibid. col. 809 seq. Note the words : " Now I begin to be a true disciple"—by suffering and martyrdom.

³ It is a pleasure to point out in this connection two recent articles, one by P. P. Gächter, *Unsere Einheit mit Christus nach dem hl. Irenaeus*, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 58, (1934), 503—532 ; the other one by A. Verrielle, *Le plan du salut d'après S. Irénée*—*Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 14me. année, October 1934. p. 493—524.

⁴ Adv. Haer., II, 26, P.G. 7, 800 A.

⁵ Ibid., B.

the intellect, but full life, which consists at the same time in submission to God, contemplation of God and fruition of His goodness. The will has therefore as much part as the intelligence in this mysticism; and one must add that the inclination of the will, which *is* literally charity, precedes vision, as a necessary condition for man, though not binding for God: "Etiam hoc concedit (Deus) iis qui se diligunt, id est videre Deum"; but "homo a se non videt Deum; ille autem volens videtur hominibus, quibus vult, et quando vult, et quomodo vult . . ." ¹ never in any case outside of Christ and of submission to His Church.²

This spiritual teaching lasted much longer in a place which Christianity reached before Hellenic philosophy—Syria of Syrian speech. Whilst at Antioch such writers as Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia paved the way for Nestorianism by their argumentative mentality; further East, Doctors who knew nothing, or would know nothing, of profane philosophy, were still writing works of a purely scriptural and evangelical inspiration. Not only Aphraates³ and St. Ephraem,⁴ but right up to the beginning of the sixth century, James of Sarugh,⁵ taught Christian perfection outside of all philosophical system. When we know the chronology of the works of Philoxenus of Mabbogh, then we shall be able to fix, to within a few years, the date of the first appearance of Greek philosophy in Syrian spiritual teaching. The Discourses of Philoxenus: "On the Way to reach Spiritual Love, from which is born Perfection" ⁶ (notice the title), though they were intended to be a systematic treatise, were nevertheless still unaware of the explicit tending towards contemplation as the aim of the spiritual life. Some twenty years later, the same Doctor adopted in its main lines the teaching of Evagrius Ponticus.⁷ A hundred and fifty years before him, Aphraates had also undertaken to write "as a disciple of the Holy Scriptures" a didactic treatise: "On Faith and the Works by

¹ Ibid. IV, 20, col. 1035 A.

² Ibid. III, 24, col. 966; IV, 33, 7, col. 1076 seq.

³ I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Die Gottheit Christi bei Afrahat, Orientalia Christiana*, XIII, 3 (1933), p. 22—27: *Die literarischen Quellen des Afrahat*.

⁴ "Dogmatische Spekulation liegt ihm ubrigens fern." O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* IV. (1924), o. 343.

⁵ This is the conclusion of a careful study of *Homiliae Selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis*, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris, 1905—1910, 5 Vols. So one cannot doubt the statement of Barhebraeus, making of James of Sarugh a translator of Evagrius. (A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der Syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922, p. 149.)

⁶ E. A. Wallis Budge. *The Discourses of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbogh*, London, 1894, 2 Vols.

⁷ I. Hausherr, *Contemplation et Sainteté, une Mise au Point par Philoxène de Mabbogh—Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, XIV. 1933, p. 171—195.

which it is Perfected.”¹—“The foundation of the whole building is faith, because through it man is established on the rock which is Our Lord Jesus Christ.”²

“Good works” are fasting (by which is meant mortification), prayer, a fervent love for Christ, humility . . . a definite choice of peace with all men and in all circumstances, virginity or continence . . . “Perfection” is charity. Aphraates knew from experience the sweetness of union with God and of mystical rapture,³ but it did not occur to him to make of contemplation an integral part of the structure of holiness.

As for St. Ephraem, he could not be satisfied with a mere omission. Like St. Irenaeus, he had to fight against the claims of the “Scrutators.”⁴ To oppose their tenets, he overwhelmed the human mind with proofs of its powerlessness, to the point of wearying the modern reader, though not himself! And it is no good saying that all this controversy has nothing to do with spirituality. It shows that for the Syrian Doctor, the will counted the most among the human faculties, at least in this world. For this reason, he ranked Martha above Mary, because “directly Our Lord came, she was the first to put herself at His service”⁵—proof that her charity was more fervent than Mary’s. He writes, commenting on Romans viii, 16: “The Spirit Himself giveth testimony to our spirit (that is to say, to our conscience), that we are the sons of God (and servants of Christ, *by our works*.)”⁶ We will find other spiritual teachers identifying divine adoption with contemplation. There lies the great difference. Though, like Aphraates, Ephraem was not in any way ignorant of mystical gifts—so far from it that some pages of his remind one of Dionysius⁷—he no more proposes them as an end to aim at, than does Aphraates. According to him, attainment of such gifts is more likely the less one aspires to them.⁸

Briefly, for all these ancient writers, man was above all a free will, capable of love and of sacrifice for love. Therefore all human perfection consisted for them in charity and in the abnegation which proves it.

¹ *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes*, ed. J. Parisot, *Patrologia Syriaca* I, p. 3.

² *Ibid.* “*Demonst . . .*” I, 2, p. 7.

³ Article *Aphraate* in the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* de M. Viller, fasc. 3.

⁴ See specially the Roman edition, *S. P. N. Ephraem Syri opera omnia quae exstant . . .* 1732—1746, t. VI, p. 1—208, “*Adversus Scrutatores*.”

⁵ I. Huasherr “*Utrum Sanctus Ephraem Mariam Marthae plus aequo anteposuerit?*” in *De Doctrina Spirituali christianorum orientalium, Quaestiones et Scripta, Orientalia Christiana*, XXX, 3. (1933) p. 153—163.

⁶ *Sancti Ephraemi Scripta* (in Armenian), Venice, 1836, t. 3, p. 32.

⁷ *Adv : scrut* ; IV, V, XLIV ; *De Fide* III, Ed. Rom. VI, 205 B—E.

⁸ The translation of the Syriac into Latin, thus :—“*Ita poterit attingere, si non curret ut attingat.*” *Adv. Scrut.* IV, Ed. Rom : VI, p. 7 F.

II.

INTELLECTUALIST SPIRITUALITY.

Such a conception could not satisfy thinkers imbued with the Hellenism which had long ago stated, through Anaxagoras of Clazomenae : “θεωοία ἐστὶ τέλος τοῦ βίου.” “The object of life is speculation.” Clement of Alexandria has kept this axiom for us.¹ The philosopher (for Clement, it was Plato) had characterised races thus :—(according to his tripartite psychology)—according to intelligence, the race that was friendly to learning, the Greeks ; the Thracians and Scythians, according to a tendency to anger ; and the Semites according to a desire for worldly goods and the love of gain.² . . . Later on, in much the same way, others will have distinguished angels, demons and men.³ Aristotle, far from contradicting his master on this point, had rather added to his intellectualism. True, the Stoics had come, and the Cynics, who had rehabilitated “praxis” nay, even “askesis”⁴ ; but this latter remained a poor cinderella whose only task was to prepare the banquet for the chief faculty, the “hegemonikon” (intellect.) Then Philo and the Gnostics had removed those principles to the religious domain ; religion became true philosophy and consequently “theoria” the aim of religion. Evagrius Ponticus only condensed the ideas of Clement and Origen in one axiomatic sentence, when he wrote, at the head of his “Practicos”⁵ : “Christianity is the law of Jesus Christ, made up of the practice of virtue, natural contemplation and theology,” *i.e.* mystical contemplation of God ; here it is not in any way a question of theology in the scholastic sense of the word.

From that time we find this astonishing phenomenon, faith and good works no longer leading directly to perfection, but rather to charity, the aim, no longer of all the spiritual life, but only of the third and lowest way, that of “praxis” or the way of the Commandments. Charity was only the door to gnosis,⁶ simply an introducer into the kingdom of heaven, or inferior contemplation—instead of being the queen of the very kingdom of God, or higher contemplation. How this doctrinal transformation took place is obvious : it came from an acceptance of Platonic psychology previous to that of Plotinus, or Origenism properly so called. For this latter, man—the whole of man—is intellect ; body and soul, *θῦμὸς* and *ἐπιθυμία* are

¹ Strom : II, XXI, 130. Stählin, p. 184.

² Plato, Polit : 435 e f.

³ Evagrius Ponticus, Centurie, I, 68.

⁴ *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, article “Ascèse” by Olphe-Gaillard.

⁵ PG. 40, 1221 D.

⁶ Evagrius, *Lettre d'Anatolios*, PG. 40, 1221 C.

only additions (προσθήκαι) or degradations. Nothing calling more imperatively for contemplation had been thought of. Contemplation became the one occupation worthy of humanity, the only perfection of the Christian, the end, not only of every human life, but of all creation.¹ Thomists will be reminded at once of this sentence in the "Summa contra Gentiles": "Oportet ultimum finem Universi esse bonum intellectus."² This is hardly the place to discuss how far St. Thomas agreed with our Eastern mystics; but we may at least point out a difference. The authentic spokesmen of the school which we have just mentioned despised reasoning, because they held the intellect to be essentially intuitive—on condition that, freed from passions, it could spontaneously exercise its own activity.³ By means of "apathia" brought about by asceticism, the intellect was thought to grasp without study first the essence (λόγους) of created beings; then, rejecting even this "last garment,"⁴ to find itself, if we may say so, face to face with its own naked essence, *i.e.* purely intellectual—and there to see divine light shining as in a mirror.⁵ That was the aim. Then only did one become truly a man, and simultaneously a perfect image of God, temple of the Blessed Trinity, son of God, god by grace.⁶ Divine adoption—deification—was thought to be identical with divine contemplation.

Such a theory could not fail to inspire great ardour for the pursuit of that highest good, "supreme happiness," "final goal." (ἔσχατον ὀρεχτόν).⁷

St. Basil held that the Christian's one object was salvation—the followers of this school said so too, but they added: contemplation *is* salvation. In the era of persecution, it was thought that martyrdom was perfection. Origen conceded that much, because martyrdom was the best way "of showing that we aspire to gnosis by works worthy of gnosis."⁸ Yet the teaching of that school was not expressed with the greatest clarity by Origen. The great Alexandrian had read and written too much to provide us with a clearly outlined synthesis. Rather should we go to Evagrius Ponticus to have the system in its full symmetry. Indeed, it was through him and not

¹ Evagrius, *Centurie I*, 50, 87.

² *Summa contra Gentiles*, lib. I, cap. 1.

³ 8th Letter of St. Basil. (Evagrius), PG. 32, 265 D. seq.

⁴ Evagrius, *Centurie III*, 8.

⁵ On the concurrence of the vision of self with the vision of God, see *Le Traité de l'Oraison d'Evagre le Pontique* in *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 1934, p. 145.

⁶ Viller. *Aux Sources de la Spiritualité de Saint Maxime—Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 1930, p. 255 seq.

⁷ 8th Letter of St. Basil, PG. 32, 257 A.

⁸ *Exhort. ad mari.* No. 43, PG. 11, 620 B.

directly through Origen that it was handed on to the Byzantines, Syrians and Armenians.¹ Evagrius put the following doctrine within reach of the monks, with more definite formulae than Origen: the terminology of the three ways, "praxis," "theoria physica," "theologia," on the basis of tripartite psychology: "apathia" the negative, and charity, the positive result of asceticism; the series of progressive renunciations leading to pure intellectuality; the ascent of prayer parallel with that of gnosis; the order of virtues in the first way, the different sorts of contemplation in the second, the conditions and immaterial nature of the vision of God in the third; and many other matters. Evagrius, then, organised that Eastern spiritual teaching which Origen had inspired. Thanks to him, we shall have no difficulty in recognising it in St. Maximus, St. John Climacus, Hesychius of Sinai, Philotheus of Sinai, Nicetas Stethatos, Gregory of Sinai and his successors the Hesychasts. It betrays itself both in ideas and vocabulary. The intellect often replaces the soul; sensible visions are resolutely excluded because of the tending towards the Immaterial; asceticism is undertaken to procure "apathia" and one seeks after charity out of a desire for contemplation, the latter becoming the necessary and all-sufficing sign of the perfect. Yearning for the contemplative life always produced an insurmountable obsession for the eremetical life; and finally through impatience to reach the coveted end, ingenious methods were invented to shorten the tediousness of the ascetic way. There have been variations in the course of centuries. At times, straightening towards a stricter orthodoxy;² at other times, impoverishments and simplifications required by the decadence of philosophical culture.³ One thing never changed, and that was the conviction that perfection was identical with contemplation. After complete examination, we shall always find Hellenic intellectualism: man is intellect.

III.

DIONYSIUS.

I have refrained from mentioning Dionysius in all this. And this for two reasons:

(1) Dionysius did not belong to that school. Doubtless, in a loose way, the three Dionysian orders, purification, illumination and unification, correspond to the three Evagian

¹ We are absolutely sure of this as regards the Syrians and Armenians; as for the Byzantines, one may seek for a "common source" or "intermediary" other than Evagrius; but it is doubtful whether such would ever be found.

² As in the case of St. Maximus.

³ It is the case of more than one Hesychast writer.

ways. Doubtless, too, Dionysius aspired to Divine contemplation. But Dionysius had not the same trust as Evagrius in "the unaided activity of the intellect," no more than in the wonderful power of the Commandments to lead the intellect to the Blessed Trinity. . . . He relied much more on passivity than on activity; on purifications carried out by higher hierarchies and undergone by the lower; and, at the summit, ecstasy—*θεῖα παθών*—the violence of desire snatching the intellect from the limiting bounds of its own laws to throw it into the Divine darkness. Evagrius knew nothing of ecstasy in the real sense of the word;¹ Origen rejected it.² Many subtle considerations might be made on that subject, but we may well leave them out here, for (2) however surprising this may seem to you, Dionysius had much less influence in the East than in the West. The fact is, he was hardly the founder of a school, less even with the Greeks than with the Syrians.³ Two men have commented on his work, and these far less than St. Thomas; but one of them, Pachymer, was very belated; the other, the greater, St. Maximus the Confessor, though he made an exegesis of Dionysius, remained above all a disciple of the Alexandrians and of Evagrius.⁴ Dionysius came too late, at a time when Eastern mystical teaching had received its classical form; he came, too, at a time when there were none capable of popularizing his abstruse theories expressed in too obscure a style. In the middle of the eleventh century, when Nicetas Stethatos wrote his "Centuries,"⁵ he divided them into Chapters, dealing with practical, physical and theological ways, exactly on the principle given at the beginning of Evagrius' "Practicos." And yet he knew Dionysius. But the best proof that he had not assimilated his teaching, is the fact that he inserted the three Dionysian divisions as well as he could in paragraphs 41—44 of his third "Century." Three hundred years later, Gregory Palamas⁶ did the same thing again. Dionysius remained an

¹ The word "*ἔχστασις*" is only found in his writings in the depreciatory sense of *ἔχστασις φρενῶν*. In "Centuries" Supplement 30, the Syrian translator added the word, but the Greek text has not got it. (See Muyldermans, in *Muséon* 44, 1931, p. 773).

² Vide K. Rahner, in *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique* XIII (1932), p. 135. M. Völker, *Die Vollkommenheitslehre des Origenes*, Tübingen, 1931, is less exact on this point (p. 134—144) because his concept of ecstasy is lacking in precision.

³ This is undeniable and comes from the fact that the Syrians only knew Origen's theories through Evagrius, whose works were translated not long before Dionysius' came out.

⁴ This statement was first made by P. Th. Disdier, A.A., who unfortunately has not published his great work on St. Maximus in its entirety. For Maximus' debt to Evagrius, see Viller, loc. cit.

⁵ PG. 120, 851—1012.

⁶ PG. 150, 1121—1226.

isolated mystical author, unknown and unappreciated by most ; even his authenticity was debated longer in the East than by us ; he never became *the* mystical Doctor, as in the West. It is useless to insist on the importance of this fact in the study of Eastern spirituality.

(*To be continued.*)

I. HAUSHERR, S.J.

VLADIMIR SOLOVIEV

AN INTERPRETATION.

(III)

(*continued*)

POSITIVE CRITICISM OF THE SOPHIA-IDEA.

THE problem which underlies the Sophia-doctrine is old. It is the problem of the ontological relations between man and God. Up and down the centuries, the noblest minds went out on this noblest of quests. Upon this problem not only philosophy but religion itself and the whole of reality are hinged. More than anything else this problem is man's own. It conceals the clear vision of his very *raison d'être*. It is the key-position on which the whole strategy of life depends. In various ages it was variously named. The one and the manifold, the eternal essences, the first Mover and the moved, the World-Soul, creation, time and eternity, the universals, appearance and reality, essence and existence, subject and object, all these terms are but different labels or rather different methods of approach of the fundamental problem and its still more fundamental issue. Sometimes men approached it by the way of reason alone, sometimes they tried to approach it along the path of internal experience, sometimes too they took the shortcut of love. But love itself escapes all syllogism. In fact, each man for himself and mankind as a whole will have to solve the problem day by day, laboriously, and will see the final issue clearly but after having chosen in darkness and for eternity. Yet, there is no vanity in guiding our groping hands by the light which God keeps burning in our souls.

The relations between God and man may be conceived in three different ways. If we apply the same standards to measure God and to measure man, we take the way of *univocality*. This does not necessarily imply absolute identity, but it does most certainly imply that there is no *essential* difference, but only a difference of *degree*, be it a different degree of intensity or of quantity. It must be noted however

that to treat of intensity as a matter of degrees necessarily implies the introduction of quantity into the question of intensity, and thus betrays a materialistically tinged outlook. If we deny all possibility of finding out which are the relations between God and man, we practically deny that they exist. In this case we hold that the terms in which we think of God or speak of God are all purely and simply *equivocal*, and hence, when applied to God, void of all sense. This is the way of agnosticism. Some modern authors argue that there is a way of interior experience, of mysticism, which allows man to approach God without what they scornfully call intellectualism. It is, however, very hard to see how a mystical intuition (act of our *mind*) can sincerely accept God at the very moment that our reason (also act of our *mind*) equally sincerely dismisses Him with an "Amen I say to you, I know you not." At the end of the road of *equivocality* we find that, since the spirit finds its proper *raison d'être* but in the adherence to an existing God, we bury our own spiritual soul when we try to bury God. There is a golden mean: the way of *analogy*.

Soloviev took the road of univocality. He admitted of no positive existence outside God.¹ If he conceived the Sophia as partly in act and partly in potency, if he conceived the creature as potentially of the same substance as the Blessed Trinity, he did so because spell-bound by the axiom that God alone *is*. The limitation of the problem Creator-creature to divine immanence exclusively, led astray the whole philosophical synthesis of Soloviev, though it was not so much his as that of his idealistic surroundings. The question was and is: we are not God and yet in a certain way we must be God otherwise we make ourselves God by assuming an independent existence. Thus the question is a dilemma: if we really are outside God, we set up a new series of other gods side by side with the Absolute One; if we accept God as the Absolute, the only Existing, there is but one way of explaining our own existence and that is by making it a pure and simple share in the Absolute. Both univocality and equivocality solve the dilemma by choosing one of the terms and leaving the other alone. Equivocality and agnosticism lead to radical scepticism, because equivocal terms ruin the very possibility of judgment, as they do not allow of any comparison which is the essence of judgment. Univocality must needs lead to either reducing God to human proportions or to swelling man to divine proportions. In most cases it reduces God and swells man in turn, a liberty which does not put one at ease in ontology.

¹ *Russia and the Universal Church*, second edition, Paris, 1906, pp. 231—235. We have tried to expose Soloviev's thought as worked out in this book in a preceding essay: *E.C.Q.*, 1937, pp. 65—78.

Now, idealism cannot but choose the road of univocality. It is too honest, too intelligent and too religious to be satisfied with gross agnosticism. But, however idealistic the apparel, the fundamental flaw of univocality turns all idealism into a rattling skeleton.

Baron von Hügel writes : " For one thing, modern philosophy started with a strong emphasis upon the subject, and this starting-point was first impressively articulated in Descartes' famous (but, alas, dangerously inadequate) fundamental formula—his one axiom—' cogito, ergo sum.' We thus take for granted, as rock-certain, what is demonstrably non-existent; ' I think ' instead of ' I think such and such realities,' or, at least, ' I think such and such objects.' The subject and object, always interconnected in man's actual experience and hence to be assumed in this their inter-connection, were thus severed from each other, in the very starting-point of philosophy ; and then this severance and quite artificial separateness could hardly any more be bridged over—the object could hardly be recovered, since man (after all) is in fact restricted, and is here rightly recognized as restricted, to the analysis of what actually exists, and to what he really experiences. The appeal here to experience and to its analysis was, then, right ; what was wrong was the exclusion, before any and all investigation and without any justification, of one entire third of every living experience. For all experience is always threefold : it is always simultaneously experience of the subject, of the object, and of the overbridging thought ; indeed, clear consciousness always first concerns the object, and only much later on the subject."¹ This subjectivism underlies all subsequent idealism. The reign of philosophy is co-extensive with the reign of the subjective human mind, all reality is flattened out to be on a level with man. And if we are bound to admit the absolute, this absolute must be conceived in a human way and must be spoken of in human terms. Man himself becomes the transcendental that embraces all reality, man has become once more the measure of all things as in olden days Protagoras said. Now, if ideas have no other contents beyond plain human values, they can carry our mind no further than the plain human reality. They will always have the plain human meaning. This implies that our mind is blind to any *diversity*, it knows but of *differences* which are merely a matter of *more* and *less*. Thus Creator and creature become one immense compact *univocal* whole. Then we can hardly be astonished to hear Hegel say that without creation God is not God. On exactly the same lines goes the thought of Soloviev when he maintains that part of the Sophia, the

¹ *Religion and Agnosticism*, London, 1931, p. 188 f.

divine substance, is in potency. To introduce potency into the Divine, is to conceive of God in human values, is to think and speak of God and man in a *univocal* way. For univocal terms have only one meaning, in the actual case the *human* meaning. But to speak of God as of an absolute expansion of the empirical man is nothing short of a materialization of God. And thus it comes about that subjectivism, individualism, idealism turn out, by a tragic irony of truth, to be different forms of materialism, in spite of their sincere dithyrambs on the glory and power of the mind-spirit. A mind nourished with the "peripatetic milk" (Cajetan) of St. Thomas will find nothing exorbitant in such a conclusion. For a Thomist, the line of demarcation between the material and the immaterial world is knowledge. The root of knowledge is immateriality. For knowledge is the reception, in a subject, of some other form than its own, leaving to that other form its full objectivity, its complete otherness. Matter cannot receive a form as other. It is limited to its own form, to being Subject. When another form comes in, the first form disappears: water expels the forms of H and O; if the forms of H and O reappear, the form of water is gone. Hence, a knowing Subject excels a material Subject precisely because the knowing Subject can become an indefinite number of Objects, leaving those Objects in their objectivity, their otherness, and not losing thereby its own subjectivity. Now the idealistic position is characterized by its considering all objects not in their objectivity but as mere aspects of the evolving mind-Subject. Of course, the mind of an idealist is just as much spiritual as that of a Thomist. But the idealist is a materialist, because, like matter, he limits himself exclusively to his subjectivity, whilst the Thomist is a spiritualist as well as a realist, because he overcomes the limits of his subjectivity by respecting, and going out to, other forms, leaving them in their otherness, their objectivity; thereby he proves his spiritual mentality and his horizons expand sufficiently to embrace all objective reality.

It may be noted, by the way, that this explains why communism and socialism identify themselves with materialism: Hegelianism was their hot-bed. And if we add that there is a radical contradiction at the root of communism and socialism because they are but monstrously generalized individualisms, we shall have put our finger on the most vulnerable spot of these two systems.

Putting things in this way—we are thoroughly aware of it—is not doing justice to the riches and nobility of the idealistic effort, and the highly valuable minds which made this effort or contributed to it. But then, truth is uncompromising by

nature, and no brilliant apparel of honesty and sincerity borrowed from noble souls can protect falsehood from the pure gaze of truth. The reign of truth cannot be a kingdom divided against itself.

We said above that the problem: Creator-creature, was a dilemma. At least idealism and agnosticism take it as such. In reality there is no dilemma. For a dilemma implies the incompatibility of the two terms, whilst Creator and creature are by no means incompatible. If this were so the act of creation would be a contradiction in itself, because Creator and creature are no more than the Cause and the effect of this act of creation. The dilemma-aspect of creation comes precisely from univocation of the terms and from considering creation as a human action. But creation in its strict sense does not exist in the realm of human capacity. Now, unlike idealism and agnosticism, catholic philosophy does not try to force the facts of reality into the narrow frame of the subjective mind, but to adapt the human mind to objective reality. Catholic philosophy starts by humbly accepting the most obvious and ineluctable of facts testified by the individual and common, interior and exterior experience of man, the fact that man is a being limited, conditioned, dependent, relative, and then—the great word—caused. Some hate that experience as the most odious of nightmares, they fight it, they pretend to deny it, to break it. But they contradict their own nature, their life is an incarnate schism, a running wound. *Superbia vitae*. Others accept the experience, they fight the unreasonable rejection of objective facts till there is the tranquillity of order, till there is harmony within and harmony without, till there is but one universal harmony, till there is peace. This basic experience is not exclusively an act of the subjective mind. It is the synthesis of sense-perception, mind-perception and the objective reality which is not ourselves. This experience is an infinitesimal but positive element of the whole objective reality, and as such it opens to man the roads to horizons as wide as the objective reality is universal. In catholic philosophy man prefers the exquisite perfection of a flower in the universal harmony of colour and fragrance, depending on and joyfully responding to the warm light of the one sun, to the primitive perfection of the solitary star shining only in darkness, admired at a distance but not loved and not loving. The living synthesis and harmony of subject and object which lies at the root of catholic philosophy, makes this philosophy the champion of life and love, and the safe-guard of common sense rapidly disappearing in our days, as in every world-crisis.

Starting from this basic experience, catholic philosophy

cannot but arrive at two facts which are the contents of this experience : the fact of existence as something received, and the fact of causality. We realize only too well that we cannot say of ourselves : "I am Who am," that we are not existing by right of nature, that, therefore, there must be a radical distinction between our nature or essence and our existence. On the other hand if we do not exist by nature, that is by an intrinsic cause, we must exist by an extrinsic cause. Moreover, as it is not just a part but the whole of our existence which depends on that extrinsic cause, our dependence on that cause is absolute, radical. Our limitation is not a particular aspect of our being, but a universal one. We are, and every creature is, radically dependent, limited, conditioned, caused beings. This complete and universal, ontological dependence postulates a complete and universal, ontological independence. Limitation is meaningless if there is not an Unlimited ; the relative, if not an empty word, must refer to an Absolute ; the partial is senseless if there is not an exhaustive Total. The name of this Unlimited, Absolute, Total Being is God.

The two facts implied in the fundamental experience of dependence form the key-position of catholic philosophy in the problem of the relations between man and God. This problem may, for clarity's sake, be considered to have two aspects : an abstract, logical aspect and a concrete ontological aspect. The abstract or logical aspect considers the problem as a noetical one. The concrete ontological aspect considers the problem in its fullest reality. The first, noetical, problem is solved by analogy ; the second by creation.

The noetical problem : how can we know God and what can we affirm about God, cannot be solved without a general understanding of essence and existence. Now, essence embraces all that is contained in the answer to the question : *what* is it ? Essence is that in virtue of which a thing is what it is. It is qualification, determination, and is identical with nature, idea, form, and is expressed in the definition of the thing. It makes a man a man and a dog a dog. Existence on the other hand, does not tell us *what* a thing is, but *whether* a thing is. Existence is that in virtue of which a thing belongs to the order of concrete reality, it makes a thing a *fact*, and nothing more than a fact. That is to say that, though the ultimate perfection of a thing, it is void of all qualification, and that, though introducing a thing into concrete reality, it does not in any way affect the idea or form or nature or essence of a thing. Existence therefore is a *blind* perfection, however important : all its meaning derives from the essence which existence invests with actuality.

Now, catholic philosophy starts by concluding from the mere *fact* of the *existence* of the effect to the mere *fact* of the *existence* of the cause. This conclusion implies no univocence, for univocation is a matter of meaning derived from essence concerning which the argument so far says nothing. It simply says : it is ; it does not say what or how it is. Yet there is more. We have been forced to draw this conclusion by the very fact of our being limited, conditioned, relative, by the fact of that universal dependence at the root of all created being. Hence, having admitted the existence of a universal cause postulated by a universal effect, we implicitly attribute absolute being to the cause, for a universal cause can be but an uncaused cause. This means that we are fully aware of the fact that, granted this cause exists, it must exist as a universal cause, it must exist in its own way, it cannot possibly exist in the way of an effect. And this consideration leads the way to a knowledge of God which, as knowledge, is plainly opposed to agnosticism, and which, recognizing the infinite distance between an effect and a universal cause, admits of two radically divergent ways of existence and is thus opposed to univocation. This knowledge thinks of God, not in univocal terms, but in terms first submitted to a thorough purification. This purification takes place in a double process : we eliminate from a given notion all that smacks of imperfection (*via remotionis*), and we sublimate it so as to enable it to fit absolute perfection (*via eminentiae*). For instance, we say God is wise. What do we mean? Knowing that wisdom is a pure perfection, we conclude from its existence in man to its existence in God, but we add that the wisdom of God is of a nature simply divergent from the wisdom of man. This is no equivocation, for wisdom remains wisdom. Hence there is that peculiar note of a great similitude and a yet greater dissimilitude of which the fourth Lateran Council (1215, c. 2) spoke.¹ This knowledge of similitude and yet greater dissimilitude is the knowledge of *analogy*, and the terms in which we speak of God are not the terms of agnostic despair, nor those of idealistic camaraderie but the analogous terms of loving adoration inspired by filial fear.

Univocation levels all reality by "humanizing" it all. Equivocation blinds itself to anything above the human level. Both are imprisoned in that narrow self of man. Analogy conceives of human nature as one level among many others, it admits of *diversity of natures* : and thereby it pulls down the compressing walls of a humanity isolated and without a *raison d'être* in the midst of an unintelligible quasi-infinite

¹ Cfr. E. Przywara, *Polarity*, Oxf. Univ. Press, 1935, p. 31 (translated from the German by A. Bouquet).

reality. Analogy frees man from the throttling grip of his self, it is supremely liberating. With those diverse essences, visible in the light of analogy alone, life becomes infinitely rich and full of colour again, new horizons are thrown open, infinite possibilities lie in waiting for man, that spoiled child of creation. Here we touch upon another feature of analogy. Life and reality are things full of wonder. From the cradle to the grave man has to feel his way through uncertainty and mystery. Whether we study the mystic or the sufferer, whether we watch man at the end or at the start of the road, everywhere we meet that mystery of powers not so much irrational as supra-rational. Without this sense of mystery reality is no longer real, it becomes an automatic, pallid, logical deduction, which is contrary to our most fundamental experiences. In fact, Soloviev himself, though so constantly anxious to maintain universal liberty, equally constantly affirms the strictly deductive character of the evolution of the universe.² Analogy alone respects full reality and leaves ample room for that universal mystery. Agnostic equivocation does away with the mystery altogether. For univocation everything is clear : the idealistic reality is but one plain syllogism. Analogy accepts the mystery, it imposes the existence of the mystery, but it equally imposes our radical incapacity of fathoming the mystery. Thus, analogy is religious, analogy is prayer.

The first conclusion taught by analogy on the subject of God is that, as the radical dependence of the creature is indelibly engraved in its very being by the complete distinction of essence and existence, so the radical independence of the Creator is, for us, best expressed by the denial of that distinction in God, that is, by the affirmation of complete identity of essence and existence in God. God is absolutely one with not even a possibility of division such as is implied in potency. Without this identity God is no longer God, for essence and existence would postulate an ulterior principle of unification to overcome even a merely possible separation. This fundamental truth makes the doctrine of the Sophia (divine substance consisting of potency and act) radically irreconcilable with catholic orthodox tradition as well as with the fundamental exigencies of reason which reflect eternal truth. The first weakness in the Sophia-thesis is an altogether too vague notion about essence and existence. For, if we examine Soloviev's exposition closely, we cannot fail to notice that though speaking of substance, essence and existence, he in fact makes them

² Cfr. A. Kojevnikov, "La métaphysique religieuse de Vladimir Soloviev," in : *Revue d'Histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 1935, pp. 131 and 145.

three different essences, or three different natures. Now it will be evident from what we said above that to oppose essence to existence as if existence had a nature of its own which makes it something complete and enables it to "possess" and to "give" and to "play" with essence in time and space, is metaphysically untenable. For this existence is either *something* existing, and then it is no longer pure existence but implies essence and subsistence, or it is pure existence but then it is a dull and dead abstraction void of all meaning, incapable of possessing and of subsisting. The divine duality and trinity in Soloviev's philosophy are simply a duality and trinity of nature, things that in their crudity affect a Christian painfully. It is not difficult to explain the Trinity without the absolute oneness which implies the complete identity of essence and existence. To a Catholic mind the idealistic explanation of the Trinity cannot fail to appear somewhat gross. But, curiously enough, what destroys the oneness of the Trinity, destroys the real duality of nature in the Incarnation as well. For the Sophia-thesis conceives this Mystery as the individual achievement of the identification of the eternal Sophia (or Sophia in act) with the temporal Sophia (or the Sophia in potency). But the mystery of the Incarnation as it is proposed by the genuine Catholic orthodox tradition, implies precisely the radical distinction between the two natures eternally persisting in their hypostatic union.¹ The Sophia-interpretation of the Incarnation cannot but emasculate the whole mystery of Christ and His Redemption.

But to have shown the disastrous consequences of the Sophia-thesis in regard to the Mysteries of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation is not sufficient. There remains the problem of the relation of creature and Creator, and as we have said before, the univocal view taken by idealism in this question provoked Soloviev's philosophical elaboration of the Sophia and in its turn the Sophia required the unhappy interpretation of the two fundamental Christian Mysteries. We have already seen the noetic aspect of the problem and shown how catholic philosophy solves it by analogy. It now remains to consider the problem in its concrete aspect, the problem as it is laid out before our eyes in glowing reality. Here catholic philosophy offers its thesis on creation. Creation may be said to be in the concrete ontological order what analogy is in the abstract logical order. "Being" sums up all the possible qualifications not only of man, but of the animal, plant and mineral, in short : of all that exists or merely may exist. Outside being there is but unqualifiable nothing-

¹ It has not been sufficiently noted that Christ, either Human or Divine, has practically no personal rôle to play in the Sophian synthesis.

ness. Being is universal, positive, all-embracing. To say then that being as such is caused is to affirm an absolute dependence of the subject of this being, in its essence as well as in its existence. On the other hand, to say that something is cause of being as such is to affirm its absolute independence and absolute freedom. Now, creation is the production of being in its universal signification out of nothing. It is the production of being as a whole, as such, and hence independent of previously existing matter, space or time, independent too of all intrinsic necessity. It is absolute production, divine production. Of such a production the first term can be but God, the second term can be but the creature. It is essential to see the absoluteness of this action. God is unconditioned, He cannot depend on anyone or anything. There is nothing previous to God. There is nothing after God. Nothing runs parallel to God. God's Being requires no substratum to rest upon. God's action requires no matter to work upon. Unconditioned, uncaused, He is not His own condition, not His own cause. He is, and He alone is in the full sense of the word : I am Who am. He alone conditions and causes all. He does not depend on a proof : He furnishes all proofs. God is not dependent on metaphysics : the whole metaphysical order with its eternal grandeur flows forth from His essential Givenness. He is the Datum Which precedes all assumption, He the Premiss Which precedes all conclusion. He is unlimited, but He is not indefinite. For the indefinite is still limited by the definite as a possibility is limited by a particular fact. God is not indefinite but infinite, endless. He is endless in power, He is endless in being. He is endless in power because He is endless in being. No circle of space, no segment of time can serve as contour to His Being. Such is the God of our fathers, the God shown to us in the dim light of analogy. Such is the God of creation.

The term of creation cannot be another Absolute, for two Absolutes are contradictory, and the created absolute would be radically inferior to the uncreated Absolute. No creature can therefore be absolute : God cannot create an absolute. The creature then is essentially relative : it cannot be unless it be on a diverse level, on the level of an effect completely and universally depending on its Cause. The distance from Creator to creature is unbridgeable. There is diversity of level. And thus there is no being added to the absolute Being, for addition requires of all necessity equality of level : the relative can never and in no way add real being to the Absolute, however independently that relative being exists. This diversity of being, of level of existence, taught by analogy,

thus admits of a positive existence without in the least encroaching on the idea of divinity. On the other hand, the very absoluteness of the Creator implies that the creature must needs be a reflection of the Creator. All production is a gift. And just as no one can give what he does not possess, so no one can produce but what he possesses in his being. All production is a reproduction. So in the case of God: He cannot create unless He creates to His image and likeness. This means that nothing can exist outside God which does not exist as a participation of God. This participation or outward imitation of God is expressed in the 'idea' or the essence. This essence is the way in which the Divine perfection may be participated. Abstracting from all subsistence and existence this essence is called a *possibile*. It is Divine perfection itself as outwardly imitable. The *possibilia* strictly so called are the Divine Ideas Which presided over creation. The relations thus arising between Creator and creature may be best understood by reflecting on something analogical in the purely human sphere: art. If we imagine an artist producing a work of art without any tools: brushes, etc., without any matter like paint and canvas, without drawing his inspiration from anything outside himself, leaving the pure and simple inspiration by which the work is conceived, and the pure and simple will to grant to the work thus conceived an objective existence, then we are approaching, as far as human notions are allowed to approach, the Divine Artist. The work of art is something radically different from, radically unidentifiable with the artist. Yet, the work of art is by its very nature the reproduction of the artist's soul. So the Creator, as imitable outwardly, is in essence and existence simply diverse and hence infinitely distant from the essence and existence of the creature. And yet Creator and creature are inseparably united as the Cause is always and immediately the cause of the effect, and the effect always and immediately the effect of the cause. St. Thomas: "A creature may be said to be in God in a twofold way. First, as in the Cause Which governs it and conserves it in its created being. Thus we presuppose the creature's being to be distinct from the Creator, for to be a 'creature' means to receive being from God. A creature indeed cannot be said to be conserved in existence unless as already possessing existence in its own nature, according to which created existence it is distinct from God. Hence a creature thus existing in God is not the creating Essence. Secondly a creature may be said to be in God as in the power of the acting cause, or as in the knowing cause: and thus the creature in God is the Divine Essence itself, as is said in John 1, 3: What was made, was life in

Him. Although a creature existing in this way in God is the Divine Essence, this does not imply that there is only one creature present there, but many. For the Essence of God is sufficient means to know diverse creatures, and sufficient power to produce them." (Quest. de Potentia, qu. iii, art. 16, ad 24 um). Such language seems strangely similar to that of Soloviev. Yet this strange and apparent similarity conceals the very starting-point of an unbridgable cleft. If St. Thomas is not afraid of saying that the creature may be said to be the Divine Essence, it is precisely because there is just as much distance from this creature to the objectively existing creature as from God to this objectively existing creature. There is a difference of essence and existence between these two creatures. The one in God which is God is the notion of creature purified from all that implies dependence, imperfection, *effect*, and then sublimated to the level of the perfect model, inspiration, producing power: *Cause*. The two affirmations: divine and not divine, are not contradictory, because not affirmed of the same subject but of two subjects completely diverse and yet similar, two subjects related to each other in *analogy*, the inferior pointing to the Superior in the direction of the *via remotionis* and the *via eminentiae*. This double process of analogy *removes* all that is potency in the *possibilia*, it purifies them from all independent existence distinct from the divine Idea itself. They have no intrinsic existence at all: they exist in God merely as an *aspect* of God, namely God as participable, as imitable. Hence they lack all existence in themselves; *as such* they do not even exist in *potency*: the potency is not in them but in their inferior analogue radically distinct from them. The idea of potency as such existing in God is absolutely alien to the Catholic view of creation: the similarity is never so great but the dissimilarity surpasses it. Soloviev and all those who try to justify the Sophia-principle have no such suppleness. Their univocal one-level reality is purely horizontal, and does not know of vertical possibilities. Univocation is radically incompatible with the analogical process. The *via remotionis* and the *via eminentiae* are closed to each and every system based on univocation: the *remotio* and the *eminentia* are precisely the break-through of univocation. Walled up in this univocation, idealism is absolutely powerless to remove the potency from the *possibilia*, even as existing in God. Therefore its only issue is to introduce potency into the Divine: the *possibilia* in God and the essences of concrete creation are univocal, are of one and the same nature for idealism. For Soloviev the Sophia is the whole of the *possibilia*. It has some independent existence for it enjoys real liberty. Now,

as the *possibilia* have a real independent though only potential existence in God, we understand that there is for that part of Sophia a real temptation to use its liberty and to pass from an objective but only potential existence in God to an objective but actual existence outside God. God, on the other hand, having endowed Sophia with freedom Himself, does not wish to gainsay Himself, and creation comes about by "God ceasing to react against the liberty of the chaos."¹ The fundamental univocation in Soloviev's philosophy could not be more cruelly exposed to daylight than by this view of creation. Moreover, as Sophia yields to her *temptation* we understand also why, for Soloviev, the creation is the *fall* of Sophia.²

We abstain from the unpleasant task of qualifying the Sophia-doctrine: may it suffice to say that the vice of idealism renders it unfortunately radically incompatible with the traditional orthodox catholic teaching. This teaching however must not be understood as paralysing genuine mysticism. It is of paramount importance to realize the fundamental vitality of analogy and of the correspondent view of creation. The two elements: infinite distance from and inseparable union with the Divine Lover Who created us constitute that radical "tension open upwards" so ably described by Fr. Przywara.³ And it is precisely this tension which is one of the most genuine criteria of catholic mysticism. Ruysbroeck: "We possess thus a superior life (*levende leven*: living life), which, in God, is eternal and precedes all act of creation. According to this life God created us, not drawing us from it, nor from His own Substance, but creating us out of nothing. And our created life depends on the eternal life we possess in God as in its eternal Cause, and which belongs to Him by nature. Thus our created life makes one life with that which we have in God, without intermediate. For He is a living Exemplar of all He has created; He is cause and reason of all creatures; finally, He knows Himself and He knows all things with one intuition. And all He knows distinctly in the mirror of His wisdom: images, dispositions, forms and reasons, all that is truth and life, and He Himself is that life, for in Him there is nothing but His own nature. All things, though, are in Him as in their proper cause, but without real existence. Therefore St. John said: 'All that was made was life in Him,' and that life is He Himself. Thus we all have an eternal life, above our created being, in God as in our living cause Who made and created us out of no-

¹ *Russia*, p. 231. Cfr. Kojevnikov, op. 1., p. 133.

² *Russia*, p. 236; Kojevnikov, p. 126.

³ Op. 1., p. 31 ff.

thing ; but we are not God and we have not made ourselves. Nor are we an emanation of God by nature ; but because God knew and willed us eternally in Himself, He made us, not forced by nature, not of necessity, but in the freedom of His Will.”¹ However much we look up to Soloviev, we do not think that the passage just quoted is in any way inferior to what we read in *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle*.

One more point must be settled. All this discussing of analogy and univocation may seem to certain minds rather subtle and without bearing on concrete life. Nothing would be less true than this. The best way of showing the importance of this notion of analogy, so abstract in appearance, is perhaps to consider how it affects a problem of the highest practical importance, and at the same time a problem so incessantly on the lips of the Russian philosophers of the school of Soloviev. We mean the problem of liberty. The psychological and historical reasons why precisely the Russian philosophers are so much preoccupied with this question of freedom need not be exposed here. We simply take the problem of liberty in itself. Nor are we going to treat of it *ex professo*, but we wish simply to point out how the notion of analogy is indispensable to a right understanding of freedom. Kojevnikov has already insisted on the antinomy involved in Soloviev's teaching on freedom. There is not only the difficulty of reconciling the series of free acts that make up the universal evolution with its character of a logical deduction. There is also the strange assertion concerning the freedom of the Angels, and that of men. Soloviev admits that the Angels are free to declare themselves for or against God. But this choice being a perfect act posited by a perfect nature, fixes that nature for always. This is perfectly true so far. But Soloviev does not leave the subject there. This fixing of the angel's nature “exhausts the free will”² of the Angel. Conclusion : to be fixed in the good is to lose free will. The Angel is henceforth “an organic and inseparable member of the Divinity.”³ “Only in man is the creature perfectly united to God, that is freely and reciprocally, for, thanks to his double nature, man alone can *keep* his liberty and continually remain the moral complement of God, uniting himself to Him more and more intimately by an uninterrupted series of conscious actions and deliberate actions . . . The very supernatural perfection of liberty in a pure spirit, the absence of all exterior limit, makes that this liberty, manifesting itself completely, is exhausted in one sole act ; and

¹ *The Mirror of eternal Salvation*, ch. XVII.

² *Russia*, p. 245.

³ *Russia*, p. 246.

the spiritual being loses its liberty by dint of having had too much of it. . . . On the other hand the limited and conditioned character of human liberty makes man more free than the Angels, allows him to conserve, and continually to exercise, his free will, and to remain, even after the fall, the active co-operator of the Divine work. Therefore Wisdom eternal does not find its delight in the Angels but in the Sons of man."¹ This view of liberty can be interpreted in one way only: when the Angels exercised their liberty, they had to choose between good and evil. Surely, this is a very vague idea of liberty; worse still, it is a wrong idea of liberty, for liberty is the choice of means towards an aim, never the choice between good and evil. In connection with the general Sophia-idea this sort of liberty will be still better understood. Kojevnikov: "In *La Russie* Soloviev speaks first of the 'possible reality of the chaos,' but further on he says that the chaos realizes itself *necessarily*, as soon as God ceases to suppress it. This means that the liberty of the Sophia is but a liberty of separation, that is, at bottom, a purely illusory liberty."² And elsewhere: "The 'reality' of the world would thus be but the reality of a possibility, of the possibility of Man to declare himself against God. But we have seen that without this possibility liberty itself becomes illusory: the reality of the world, therefore, is the very reality of the liberty of man and, consequently, of the Man-God. Now, we know that this liberty is real in the absolute sense of the word as it is the very being of the Absolute; the reality of the world, therefore, is also an absolute reality, and thus the world is real, not in spite of, but precisely because of its being but potency or possibility in the Absolute."³ The conclusion is that Soloviev's liberty is very vaguely defined. But he is less preoccupied with the elaboration of the concept of liberty than with its absoluteness. His words leave no doubt as to this fact. And even if they did, the way his followers have interpreted and commented on his thought is sufficient to show the direction of his ideas. N. Berdyaev's *Freedom and the spirit*, his chapter on freedom in *Dostoevsky*, are very outspoken on the matter. Now, this very absolutism in the matter of liberty again reveals that fundamental univocation: the liberty of God and the liberty of man are the same. Now it is not our business to expatiate on the manifold antinomies which this idea must needs create in a philosophical system which lays claim to the title of Christian. Kojevnikov has done this in a masterly cool and objective way. We simply

¹ *Russia*, pp. 257—258.

² Op. I., p. 134.

³ Op. I., p. 132.

wish to point out that such an idea of liberty is the very ruin of liberty. Soloviev himself often called human evolution a logical deduction and he does not seem to have been worried by the impossibility of reconciling liberty and deduction. Now, if man's liberty is absolute, he must be absolute himself. For liberty, if absolute, is, as Berdyaev would put it, to recognize no authority, to be bound by no tie, to be forced by no compulsion. This liberty, therefore, necessarily implies the fundamental, radical sufficiency of a Being Who is End in Himself and End of all things. Therefore to admit of an absolute human liberty pins us to the following dilemma : either man is End in himself, and this implies that man is God. But then man loses all reason of existence for God is God and not man, and hence this road leads to the destruction of man's liberty as it leads to the destruction of man altogether. Or man is not his own end and then his end lies beyond his own little sphere. But this is only another way of saying that man is relative, and as relative and absolute are mutually exclusive, this road leads to man's destruction too : he would be but an incarnate contradiction. Now the worst is that the Sophia-doctrine really does not admit of any liberty at all. The reality in this doctrine is one time and space embracing syllogism. Man is not a personality, he is first of all concretion of the potential part of the Divine Substance, the Sophia. He is but God going out in time, there is no union of two beings but merely the distension of one Being becoming conscious of this unity : the end is *identification*. The cruel word. Can identification be anything but a logical affirmation ? Can identification ever be free ? Identification is not a process, it is a fact : two things, two beings are identical or they are not. But identification by nature excludes all *becoming*. The Sophia robs man of all finality, for the beginning and the end coincide. Man is not only not free, man is not living, man as such is not. . . .

There are values to be saved, values that make up man's life and man's beauty. Liberty, life and love, what is man without them ? Let man go down on his knees and adore, and he will find that then alone he may become Man. Soloviev repeatedly pictured the organic nature of humanity. Man indeed is not an end in himself, he is finality, he is a tension towards God. His liberty is an *organic* liberty, the liberty which adorns the living human organism. Reflecting on this fundamental truth we may avoid the unhealthy, because non-existing, burden of liberty, of which Berdyaev spoke and Dostoievsky before him. Liberty, organic liberty, is the kingly power of dominating and possessing growth, it is the joy of concretizing an inspiration. It is a harmony, deliberately worked out by a

freely chosen combining of forces, not by arbitrary tyranny, it is love going out to conquer. This organic liberty postulates by its very nature principles of harmony, each of which becomes in turn the liberator of human love to go out and unite. True, Christ's Gospel brought liberty, but that very same Gospel was the gospel of the purging of the branches, that they may bring forth more fruit. Did not Christ Himself say: "And as the Father hath given me commandment so do I"?¹ And: "He that heareth you, heareth me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth me"?² Authority for Berdyaev means compulsion, and so it does for many of the Sophian school. In fact it only provokes a fresh wave of combining energies: human energy with the Divine energy. The dogma and the hierarchical feature of the Catholic Church are the very triumph of liberty, as they are the safe-guards, interior and exterior, of the specific human perfection and beauty which consist of *harmony, organic harmony*.

The Sophia-teaching has had and still has generous and able defenders. After Soloviev's death there has been a marked tendency which seems to assert itself with increasing boldness to identify the Sophia with Our Lady. If ever there was a painful thing for a Catholic mind, it is this development of the Sophia-doctrine. It should have been a point of honour for Catholic theologians to provide us with a real organic study of the Mother of Christ. It would have prevented such painful aberrations. However regrettable the result of their effort we cannot but feel sincerely sympathetic with the men who had the courage and the love to stand up so loyally for the Great Lady. May She reward them for this chivalry by guiding them to Christ in the one fold.

(To be concluded.)

DOM THEODORE L. WESSELING.

¹ Luke x, 16.

² John xiv, 31.

THE CHALDAEAN LITURGY

(continued.)

TECHNICAL TERMS.

G'hanta, "inclination."—A prayer said secretly whilst inclining. The first few words at the beginning and the end are repeated. See also the rubric at the "First G'hanta" in the account of the Mass.

Kushapa, "supplication."—A prayer said secretly. These prayers are no part of the original Liturgy, as may be seen from their absence in the Order of Baptism, which is constructed on the model of the Mass.

Onitha.—An anthem consisting of verses from the psalms and the Gloria Patri, etc., farced with stanzas.

Qanona.—"Canon" or ecphonesis. Thus the ending of a prayer or a formula said aloud. The responsory "Awful art thou" is styled Qanon.

'Unaya.—A responsory consisting of a theme repeated with verses in between. Also a response or answer.

THE LITURGY.

THE following account of the Mass is taken from the Chaldaean Missal printed at Mosul in 1901, entitled "Order of the Mysteries with the three Qudashe (hallowings) according to the custom of the holy Church of the East Syrians, who are the Chaldaeans." I understand that though certain rubrics are obsolete, a priest would be in order if he observed them. The numbers in brackets give the page in Brightman's account of the Nestorian Liturgy in *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. The Mosul usage is described.

To understand the reasons for the somewhat complicated ceremonial between the Gospel and the First G'hanta it is necessary to have recourse to the ancient commentators, Narsai (fifth century), Abraham bar Lipheh (seventh or eighth century) and "George of Arbel" (tenth century). Then the bema was a raised platform in the middle of the church. The first part of the Mass was said there. After the deacons had arranged the oblation on the altar during the first part of the Anthem of the Mysteries, they came down from the sanctuary at the Gloria Patri and escorted the priest and clergy, after these had washed their hands, from the bema to the sanctuary. Immediately after the Creed there followed the proclamation: "Pray for the memorial of our fathers the catholici" and the First G'hanta. The prostrations to the four sides of the bema before the Gloria Patri of the Anthem of the Mysteries (Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 269) were the preliminaries of the Entrance. They have been lost by the Chaldaeans, but are observed in the Syro-Malabar Rite at the solemn Mass called Raza.

The rubrics mention four deacons at least, including him of the Apostle and the "ceremoniar" (natar takhsa). In

practice, owing to the paucity of priests there is usually no deacon. The "deacon," therefore, is the minister. There may be any number of subdeacons, who, of course, are in minor orders.

The priest in the diaconicon washes his hands and then proceeds to vest. He then takes the chalice and paten (*pilasa*, *pathora*), worships before the altar, places the vessels upon it, the paten on his right and the chalice on his left, and descends.

The priest now begins as in the Office "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost for ever. Glory to God in the highest (thrice) and on earth peace and good hope to men at every moment for ever." The choir answers "Amen. Bless, O my lord.¹ Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come. Holy, holy, holy art thou, our Father, of the majesty of whose glory heaven and earth are full. Watchers (*i.e.* angels) and men cry unto thee, Holy, holy, holy art thou. Our Father . . . evil, for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen." The priest: "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost." The choir: "From everlasting unto everlasting. Amen and Amen. Our Father who art in heaven . . . unto thee, Holy," and the priest ends it with: "Holy, holy art thou" (252). Then follows the Prayer before the Marmitha and the marmitha or section of the psalter of the day (253). This on ordinary days consists of psalm 15, "*Domine quis habitabit*," psalm 150, "*Laudate Dominum in sanctis eius*," and psalm 117, "*Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*," the alternate verses being said by the priest and minister.

The priest now goes up to the altar and says "Halleluia, halleluia, yea halleluia" at sung Masses, and then the Prayer before the Anthem of the Sanctuary (253), after which is sung alternately in the bema and in the sanctuary the Anthem of the Sanctuary (*'onitha dh'qanke*, 253-4.) This prayer and anthem are omitted on ordinary days. Then comes the Prayer of the Lakhumara (254) and the chant of this name,² "To thee, Lord of all, we give thanks and thee, Jesus Christ, we glorify; for thou art the quickener of our bodies and thou art the saviour of our souls. (On Sundays and feasts). It is good to give thanks to the Lord and to hymn thine exalted name (or on ordinary days, I have washed my hands in purity and have encompassed thine altar, O Lord). To thee, Lord of all, etc. Glory. From everlasting. To thee, Lord of all," etc. When this chant is begun the veil of the

¹ The Nestorians consider this formula throughout the Mass to be addressed to God.

² So called from the initial words.

altar is opened and while it is being sung the priest offers the bukhra ("first-born," the Host) on the paten, pours wine crosswise into the chalice and then water and once more wine. The first three prayers are identical with the Maronite (Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient. Collectio*, II, pp. 3, 4: "Deus, qui sacrificium Abel," "Etiam hoc vinum" and "Hanc etiam aquam.") The last formula is "Water is mixed with wine and wine with water, and may the two be one, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost for ever" (251). The Host is like the Latin in shape, but of leavened bread with some salt in it. After the above mentioned chant and the Prayer of Incense the deacon censes the altar and the bishop thrice, the priest once and then the people, and goes to the diaconicon.

Then follow the Prayer of the Trisagion said aloud, and the Trisagion (255), "Holy God, holy mighty, holy immortal, have mercy upon us. Glory. Holy God. From everlasting. Holy God."

Next comes the Prayer before the Lessons said aloud (255). These, from the Old Testament, or the Acts, are read on the "left" side of the step of the sanctuary door (in the rubric, on the left side of the bema) that is on our "Epistle side." The reader comes forth from the diaconicon, worships before the altar and is blessed by the priest (255). The reader says aloud "Sit ye and be silent. The book of N. Bless, O my lord." Another reader comes with the same ceremony; the announcement is "Be silent. The prophecy of N. Bless, O my lord." The prophecy, however, may be in the first lesson; the Praxis or Acts, when read, form the second. These lessons are read only at sung Masses on Sundays, feasts and memorials, at the Noon Mass in the first, fourth and seventh weeks of Lent, and during the Supplication of Ninive.

The deacon then says "Stand ye for prayer" and the Shuraya ("beginning") of the day (256) is sung, the celebrant beginning the first verse and those in the bema answering with the second. This corresponds with the Byzantine prokeimenon. After the Prayer before the Apostle said aloud (256), the reader comes forth from the little door of the sanctuary carrying the Apostle or book of the Epistles, is blessed by the bishop or priest (257), and reads the Apostle on the same step as the Lessons but on the "right" side, our "Gospel side," saying "Amen. Be silent. Paul the apostle. Epistle to N., my brethren. Bless, O my lord." During the Prayer before the Gospel and a prayer of incense (258), both of which are said secretly, the deacon sings "Halleluia, halleluia" and the Zumara of the day (258—9, the West

Syrian hullolo), and again "Halleluia." Then on great days "Matthew and Mark and Luke and John, may your prayer be a wall to our souls," and they answer in the sanctuary, "Stand we in readiness and hear the holy Gospel" (259). The priest at the door of the sanctuary blesses the people with the Gospel saying, "Peace be with you," to which they reply, "And with thee and with thy spirit" (260). The priest reads the Gospel, beginning "The holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Preaching of N.," the response being "Glory to Christ our Lord. Amen. Be silent" (260). During the reading, lights are carried and incense burnt before the Gospel book. At the end of the Gospel the priest says "Glory to God for ever," and the choir or minister answer "Glory to Christ our Lord." The bishop kisses the text and the arch-deacon places it on the altar. On certain days the Anthem ('onitha) of the Gospel follows (261).

According to the rubric on Sundays, feasts and memorials, the litany (karo-zutha) is now said. This consists of three parts. The first begins with "Stand we fairly all of us in joy and gladness (or, with pain and diligence); let us beseech and say, O our Lord have mercy on us." R. "O our Lord have mercy on us." "Father of mercies and God of all consolation, we beseech thee." R. "O our Lord have mercy on us," and so after each clause (262—3). The second part begins with "Let us pray. Peace be with us. Let us pray and beseech God the Lord of all," the answer to each petition being "Amen" (263—6); the doctors mentioned are Gregory, Basil, John Chrysostom, James and Ephraim. The third part commences "With supplication and with beseeching we ask for an angel of peace and mercy" (266), each clause being answered with "From thee, O Lord"; it ends with "Let us commit ourselves and one another to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost," and the reply, "To thee, O Lord our God." Meanwhile the priest and deacon with the censer go to the beth gazza; the priest incenses the paten and chalice, places on the paten as many bukhre or Hosts as he wishes, mixes the chalice, and places it and the paten on the beth gazza until the end of the litany (cf. 262). In actual practice the three parts of the litany are said only at the Noon Mass of the first, fourth and seventh weeks of Lent outside the sanctuary in the bema, and the first part on every Sunday of Lent inside. The last clause "Let us commit ourselves," however, is said always. The preparation of the paten and chalice nowadays is done, as already stated, during the Lakhumara. The priest now stands in the midst of the sanctuary, or at the foot of the altar, stretching forth his hands and says aloud the prayer "Lord God mighty" (266, line 27),

that is, the prayer at the end of the litany, whether this has been said or not. The deacons then say "Amen. Bless, O my lord. Bow ye your heads for the imposition of the hand and receive the blessing" (266). The people together with the presbyters incline their heads while the priest recites the Imposition of the Hand secretly whilst bowing down. He then rises and when he has gone up to the altar lifts up his voice and completes the prayer (267).¹ Then comes the Dismissal of the Catechumens, "Whosoever hath not received baptism, let him depart. Whosoever doth not receive the sign of life, let him depart. Whosoever hath not taken it (*i.e.* the Mystery), let him depart. Depart, ye hearers, and watch the doors" (267.) These clauses are said alternately by the deacon and the priest, or at a High Mass by the two choirs. The priest now washes his hands.

Then is sung the Anthem of the Mysteries ('onitha dh'raze, 267—8), begun in the bema and repeated in the sanctuary. The rubric prescribes that while it is being sung the inner veil is to be looped up and a priest is to take from the beth gazza the chalice in his right hand and the paten in his left and so to go with ministers to the altar, where the celebrant takes them (267); all this, however, is obsolete. In practice, during the Anthem the celebrant places the paten on his left palm, crosses his hands, and takes up the chalice in his right hand, and so holding them recites quietly, "Send we up praise to thy glorious Trinity at every moment for ever." R. "Amen." The priest continues "May Christ, who was sacrificed for our salvation and bade us make memorial of his death and burial and resurrection, receive this sacrifice from our hands by his grace and mercies for ever. Amen." He then strikes the paten and chalice together three times, saying, "By thy command (thrice), O our Lord and our God, these glorious and holy and lifegiving and divine Mysteries are set and ordered upon the propitiatory altar until the coming of our Lord the second time from heaven; to whom be glory at all times for ever. Amen" (268). He then arranges the Mysteries on the altar, the paten on his right and the chalice on his left on the tablitha, and covers them with the veil (shosheppa.) He then says aloud, alternately with the choir at a solemn Mass or with the deacon at others, the concluding part of the Anthem:

Pr. "*Glory.* On the holy altar let there be the memorial of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God."

¹ The obsolete rubric reads "Here two deacons carry the cross and the gospel and two others go before them, and they stand at the door on the right and on the left. And they say 'Whosoever . . . doors.' Here they place the gospel on the altar."

Ch. "*From everlasting. Apostles of the Son and lovers of the Only-begotten, pray that there may be tranquillity in the creation.*"

Pr. "*Let all the people say Amen and Amen. Thy memorial, O our father (the saint of the church or of the day) be upon the holy altar with the just who have triumphed and the martyrs who have been crowned.*" Or the following :

"Lo, all the departed have fallen asleep upon thine hope that by thy glorious resurrection thou wilt raise them up in glory" (268).

The priest descends to the door of the sanctuary or the foot of the altar, worships, and says "With our hearts sprinkled and pure from evil conscience may we be accounted worthy to enter the holy of holies high and exalted," etc. (270.) He then goes up to the door of the sanctuary, worships, rises, turns to the people (in some places), and stretching out his hands begins the Creed, the wording of which differs from the usual Nicene Symbol (270—1); this is continued by the deacon.

The deacon or choir then begins the proclamation (karo-zutha), "Let us pray. Peace be with us. Pray for the memorial of our fathers the catholici and the bishops and of all presbyters and deacons and young men and virgins and of all those who have departed and gone forth from this world in belief of the truth," etc., ending with "Bless, O my Lord. And may this oblation be received with openness of face (confidence) and be hallowed by the word of God¹ and by the Holy Ghost, that it be unto us for help and for salvation and for life eternal in the kingdom of heaven by the grace of Christ" (271—2). It is said slowly so as to cover the following ceremonies to the ecphonesis of the First G'hanta. Meanwhile² the priest turns towards the altar and offers three metanoeae or inclinations, at each drawing nearer, saying secretly the prayer, "Glory to thee, finder of the lost," etc. (271, styled in the Second and Third Anaphoras "the

¹ Tract IV, cap. 5, of the "Book of the Pearl," written by 'Abhdisho', metropolitan of Soba in 1298 (Mai, *Script. Vet. Nova Coll.*, X, 332) deals with the Eucharist. After the account of the Last Supper, based on that in the Second and Third Anaphoras, the author continues "By this command of the Lord, therefore, the bread is changed into His Body and the wine into his precious Blood" and at the end of the chapter defines the matter of the Mystery to be that ordained by Christ, namely bread and wine, and the form "his living word and the descent of the Holy Spirit." The "word of God" thus seems to be that spoken by our Lord at the Last Supper, regarded as operative at every Mass in the same way as the creative word of God in the beginning. Cf. Chrysostom, *In prodit. Iudae*, hom. I, 6; John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa*, IV, 13.

² Some priests begin these secret prayers immediately after intoning the Creed.

first gighla," *i.e.* κύκλος.)¹ When he reaches the altar, he worships, rises and kisses the altar in the middle. He again worships, rises, and kisses the right horn, and similarly the left horn. He then kisses it in the middle and on the right and left, and turns to the deacon and says "Bless, O my Lord. My brethren, pray for me that this oblation be accomplished at my hands." The reply to this (272) is obsolete. He then proceeds with the kushapa, "Yea, O our Lord and our God" (273-4) secretly.²

The priest now stands and kisses the altar and recites the First G'hanta of the Apostles or of the Second or Third Anaphora,³ as the case may be, not stretching out his hands (274). "And know that here it is not right for him to stretch out his hands at all in that he has not received confidence. And in the other g'hantas let him stretch out his hands because he has already acquired confidence. And in every g'hanta he worships before the altar at its beginning and at its end.⁴ And let his position be distant from the altar as it were one cubit and likewise (the space) between his hands, and let him bow his head. And at the end of every g'hanta let him kiss the midst of the altar." This First G'hanta is said secretly and corresponds in sense with the West Syrian Prayer of the Veil; it is preceded by an appeal for prayers and its answer (274) which last is now obsolete. The ending is said aloud (qanona=ecphonesis), during which the priest crosses himself; the people answer "Amen." The sign of the cross is a large one; the priest lifts his hand with palm extended, so that the fingers appear above the head, brings it down a little below his breast, and carries it to the right and left slightly beyond the shoulders. By this it is understood that the people partake in the blessing. This is done in all signings. So the rubric, but in practice the sign of the cross is now made from left to right. If the patriarch, metropolitan or bishop be present, and in cathedral churches, the priest says the qanona secretly, only raising his voice at "and for ever and ever" by way of honour to the pontiff.

¹ Said thrice by the Nestorians. So also is the corresponding prayer in the Malabar books.

² So the Missal. But according to the practice described in "La Messa Caldea," referred to below, the priest begins "Bless, O my Lord" when he has first kissed the altar and continues with the kushapa during the remaining kisses and genuflexions. Nothing is said about turning to the minister. The booklet also adds a genuflexion after the final three kisses. This may be the initial worshipping of the G'hanta, v. the rubric quoted.

³ The beginning of the variable Anaphora strictly speaking, but the preceding kushapa also varies.

⁴ The genuflexion is made at the end of the prayer. The last few words are then repeated aloud and so really become part of the ecphonesis.

The priest then turns towards the people and blesses them, saying, "Peace be with you," to which they reply "And with thee and with thy spirit" (275). The deacon says "Give the peace to one another in the love of Christ" (281), and they give the peace. The deacon first kisses the priest's hand and then gives the peace to the rest of the deacons and the people. At the door of the sanctuary the chief layman places his joined hands between those of the deacon, carries them to his mouth and forehead, and conveys the peace to the others in the same way. Meanwhile, according to the rubric the deacon reads the diptychs (*dyopatkhin*) or Book of the Living and Dead (275, but misplaced by Brightman). This practice, however, has long been obsolete both among Nestorians and Chaldaeans, though the conclusion of the diptychs "And for all catholici and bishops and presbyters and deacons and all the company of those who are departed from the congregation of the Church," etc. (281—2) is still said.

The deacon now admonishes the people, "Let us all give thanks and beseech and implore the Lord in purity and groaning. Stand fairly and look on those things which are being done, the fearful Mysteries which are being hallowed," etc. (282). Meanwhile the priest says a *kushapa* (282) and then lifts the veil and winds it round the chalice and paten. A secret prayer of incense (282) follows and the altar is censured. The priest now says aloud the *qanona*, signing over the Mysteries (283):—

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all now and at all times and for ever and ever. R. Amen.

On high be your minds. R. With thee, God of Abraham, and Isaac and Israel, glorious King.

The oblation to God the Lord of all is offered. R. (It is) meet and right.

"And he lifts up his hands at every *qanona* in which (the word) 'now' occurs."

The priest now kneels and says a *kushapa* (283) secretly, then rises, kisses the altar, and with outstretched hands says quietly the *g'hanta* with its *qanona* or *ecphonesis*, the two corresponding with our Preface (283—4.) The people answer "Holy, holy, holy Lord God mighty,¹ of whose praises heaven and earth are full. Hosanna in the highest. Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed is he who came and cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest" (284). At each

¹ This is the literal translation. The word usually is rendered in liturgical translations by "of hosts," and was so in the account of the Syrian Liturgy.

"Holy" the priest makes a metanoea before the altar; the cymbals are clashed. The "Hosanna" is omitted during the whole of Lent up to the Feast of Hosannas, that is Palm Sunday.

The priest then worships and says a kushapa (284) secretly with hands extended, and after "Bless, O my Lord (thrice). My brethren, pray for me" (284), worships and proceeds quietly whilst inclining with the g'hanta (285), "And with these heavenly hosts we give thanks unto thee, O my Lord (twice)¹ [and we bless God the Word, hidden offspring from thy bosom, who, being in thy likeness and the brightness which is from thee and the image of thy being, thought this not robbery to be thine equal, but emptied himself and took the likeness of a servant and became man perfect with a rational and intelligent and immortal soul and with a mortal human body, and was (born) of a woman and was under the law that he might redeem those who were under the law, and he left unto us the memorial of our salvation, this mystery which we offer before thee. (Aloud) For when the time came when he was about to suffer and draw nigh unto death, in the night in which he was betrayed he took bread in his holy hands (the priest takes the paten in both his hands) and lifted up his eyes unto thee, God his Father Almighty, and gave thanks unto thee and blessed ✠ and brake and gave to his disciples, saying: Take eat ye, all of it, This is my Body which for you is broken for the forgiveness of sins. (They answer, Amen. And the priest worships and rises and proceeds.) Likewise after they had supped he took in his holy hands the pure chalice (the priest holds the chalice in his hands) and gave thanks unto thee and blessed ✠ and gave to his disciples, saying: Take, drink ye all of it, This is my Blood of the new eternal Testament, the mystery of faith, which for you and for many is shed for the forgiveness of sins. (And they answer, Amen. And he worships and rises and says) Whosoever ye do these things, my memory ye are remembering. (And they answer, Amen. We believe and confess).

(And he worships and rises and proceeds quietly) And as we have been commanded, we are gathered together, even we thy weak and frail and miserable servants, for thou hast wrought in us great grace which cannot be repaid in that thou didst put on our humanity that thou mightest quicken us by thy Godhead and didst exalt our lowliness and didst raise up our fall and didst make alive again our state of death and didst forgive our debts and didst justify our sinfulness and didst enlighten our understanding, and didst overcome, O

¹ The passage in square brackets is the interpolation referred to in the Note following this account of the Mass.

our Lord and our God, our enemies : : And thou didst grant victory to the weakness of our frail nature in the abundant mercies of thy grace. *Qanona* (=ecphonesis.)¹ And for all thine helps and graces towards us let us send up to thee praise and honour and thanksgiving and worship now and at all times and for ever and ever. Amen. (And he signs over the Mysteries).” The people answer “Amen.” At the words “he took bread” the deacon strikes the cymbals thrice.

The deacon now sings “In your minds pray ye. Peace be with us,” and the choir adds the *qulasa* (“praise”), “Lift up your eyes to the heights above,” etc., while the priest says various *kushapas* with extended hands (285—6). These are intercessions. In the first mention is made of “the ever-virgin my Lady Mary the blessed” and of “our holy fathers mar N., pope of Rome, and mar N., catholicos patriarch, and mar N., metropolitan (or bishop).” A proper one is for use in Masses for the departed. The priest worships, and, after “Bless, O my Lord (thrice). My brethren, pray for me,” proceeds with the *g’hanta* of intercession quietly, ending with “all the children of the holy Catholic Church, those who have been signed with the living sign of holy baptism,” when he “signs the throne from below upwards (*i.e.* on the altar from west to east) and from right to left,” whilst bowing (286—7).

The Anamnesis is now resumed (287), “We also, O my Lord, thy weak and frail and miserable servants, who are gathered together in thy name and stand before thee at this time and have received by tradition the example (*τύπος*) which is from thy Son, rejoicing and glorifying and exalting and remembering, perform this great and fearful and holy and lifegiving and divine Mystery of the passion and death and burial and resurrection of our Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ. (He takes the palla from off the chalice, lifts up his hands on high, and extends them over the Mysteries; the deacon says, In silence and in fear be ye standing and praying. Peace be with us.) And may there come, O my Lord, thine holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation of thy servants and bless it and hallow it that it may be unto us, O my Lord, for the pardon of offences and for forgiveness of sins and for the great hope of the resurrection from the dead and for the new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before thee. And for all this great and wondrous dispensation towards us let us give thanks unto thee and glorify thee without ceasing in thy Church

¹ As noted under the First *G’hanta* the ecphonesis in practice begins at : : So also at the end of the Preface and Epiclesis. In each case a genuflexion precedes the repetition.

saved by the precious Blood of thy Christ : : with open mouths and unveiled faces." The prayer ends with the canon, "Sending up praise and honour and thanksgiving and worship to thy living and lifegiving name now and at all times and for ever and ever." The priest signs over the Mysteries and the people answer "Amen." This is the end of the variable Anaphora (288).

At solemn Masses the choir now sings some verses of psalm 51, "Miserere." Meanwhile the priest offers a metanoea before the altar but without kneeling, and after two prayers (288), said inclining, recites psalm 51, inserting after each half verse "O King Christ, have mercy upon me," and after each complete verse "O King Christ, glory to thy name," and then psalm 123, "Ad te levavi . . . miserere nostri," with "I have washed my hands in purity and have encompassed thine altar, O Lord," followed by a prayer of incense (289). "And he begins the Order of Signing and Breaking." He first turns towards the deacon who incenses him, while he says aloud with hands extended a prayer (289), to which the deacon replies "Amen. Bless, O my Lord." He then turns to the altar and with hands stretched out says "Bless, O my Lord (thrice). The mercifulness of Thy grace, O our Lord and our God, bringeth us nigh unto these glorious and holy and lifegiving and divine Mysteries though we are unworthy," the deacon answering "Though in truth we are unworthy." This is said thrice; at the end of each recitation the priest folds his hands on his breast in the form of a cross and kisses the altar in the middle, on the right and on the left (289). He then worships, rises, and takes the uppermost bukhra (Host) which is in the middle of the paten in his two hands and lifts it up looking upward and saying "Praise to thine holy name, O our Lord Jesus Christ, and worship to thy sovereignty at all times for ever. Amen. For he is the living and lifegiving Bread which came down from heaven and gave life to all the world in its entirety. Those who eat it die not, and those who receive it by it are saved and by it are pardoned and by it live for ever. Amen." The choir: "Amen." Next he kisses the bukhra crosswise, from top to bottom and from right to left, but without touching it with his lips, saying "Glory to thee, O my Lord (thrice), for thine unspeakable gift towards us for ever. Amen." Choir: "Amen" (290). He holds the bukhra in his hands and says "We draw nigh in belief of the truth of thy name to these holy Mysteries and we break by thy grace and we sign by thy mercifulness the Body and Blood of our lifegiver our Lord Jesus Christ, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost for ever." Choir: "Amen" (290). Whilst

naming the Trinity he breaks the bukhra into two halves. He then places the half which is in his left hand in its place on the paten with the broken edge facing the chalice, that is the north, and with the half in his right hand signs the Blood from east to west and from north to south, dipping one third.¹ The formula is "The precious Blood is signed with the life-giving Body of our Lord Jesus Christ in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost for ever" (291). Choir: "Amen." He signs the half of the Host in the paten in the same way with the half in his hand, saying "The holy Body is signed with the propitiatory Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the name," etc. (291). Choir: "Amen." He then places the half which is in his hand on the paten upon the other half, the broken edge of the upper half being turned towards the west, that is towards himself. Next he worships, rises, and lifts up the chalice in both hands, saying secretly, "Set apart and hallowed and perfected and completed and united and commingled and attached and sealed are these glorious and holy and lifegiving and divine Mysteries one to another in the worshipful and glorious name of the glorious Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Ghost, that they may be unto us, O my Lord, for pardon of offences and forgiveness of sins and for the great hope of the resurrection from the dead and for the new life in the kingdom of heaven, now and at all times and for ever and ever. Amen." (292). He now loosens, that is places on one side, the veil which was folded round the paten and chalice and says two prayers, "Glory to thee, O our Lord Jesus Christ," and "Glory to thee, God the Father" (292—3). A short hymn such as "I am the Bread" (292) may be sung immediately after the second elevation.

He worships, rises, and kisses the altar in the middle "and cries with a loud voice like one announcing joyful tidings," saying with hands extended, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all now and at all times and for ever and ever," and making a large sign of the cross upon himself, "because this signing is made on behalf of the people although upon himself." R. "Amen" (293).

The deacon or choir proclaims "Let us all with fear and reverence draw nigh unto the Mysteries of the precious Body and Blood of our Saviour with pure heart and true faith,"

¹ The rubric continues "that is the third of both portions. So he signs the chalice with the half of the bukhra and not with its upper side and with its edge but with the part where it is broken, the front of the half looking towards (the chalice)" (291, 15—21). This is obsolete. The present practice appears in the Nestorian codex translated by Renaudot (*op. cit.*, II, p. 594).

etc. (293—4). Meanwhile the priest with extended hands says a prayer (293) and breaks the Body “and places coals (particles) on the table (paten) for the communicants.”¹ The diaconal proclamation ends with a short dialogue, the people answering each clause with “O Lord, pardon the sins and shortcomings of thy servants”; on its completion the deacon says “Let us pray. Peace be with us” (294—5). The priest then recites in secret, whilst inclining, the prayer introducing the Pater noster (295). This is ended aloud, the priest rising to his full height and extending his hands, after which the people recite the Lord’s Prayer with “For thine is the kingdom,” etc. The Embolism is said in an audible voice, the hands being stretched forth, and at its end at “Now (and at all times)” the priest signs himself; the people answer ‘Amen’” (296).

Then comes “Peace be with you” and the response “And with thee and with thy spirit.” The priest says “The holy thing becometh the holy in perfection,” to which is answered “One holy Father, one holy Son, one holy Spirit. Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost for ever and ever. Amen” (296).

On feasts of the Lord this is immediately followed by a responsory or qanon, “Awful art thou, O God most high, from thine holy place for ever and ever. Blessed is the honour of the Lord from his place.” The veil is drawn to and those within the sanctuary standing before the altar, begin “Awful art thou” quietly; they then repeat it in a loud voice, and the people in the nave again repeat it. Then follow verses, after each of which is repeated “Awful art thou.” When the qanon is finished the veil is drawn back (297).

The deacon now says “Praise ye the living God” (298), and they answer “Praise (be) to him in his Church and upon us his mercies and his grace at all times and moments.” Those in the bema now sing the Responsory of the Bema (‘unaya dh’bem). This consists of the theme and then verses, each followed by the theme.² While this or rather while “Praise (be) to him” is being chanted, the priest joins the two halves of the bukhra and holding them in his left hand over the chalice standing on the altar turns half round and shows the Host to the people, saying, secretly, “O Son, who gavest us thy Body and Blood, give us life in thy kingdom,” or else “Lamb of the living God, who takest away the sin of

¹ The comminution is now obsolete.

² This varies. In the Ordinary of the Mass the ‘unaya is “Blessed be thy Body and thy Blood, O our Lord, which thou hast given as propitiation to the peoples, and thereby hast hallowed our nature, that we may sing praise to thy sovereignty” (298).

the world, pardon us, O my Lord. Lamb . . . hear us, O my Lord. Lamb . . . have mercy upon us." This last formula is of Latin origin, but curiously the form is that used in the litanies and not that of the Mass.

The priest now prepares for his Communion. He first stands a little away from the altar, turns to the people, and asks their prayers secretly. He then approaches the altar and after two short prayers in secret (for the second see 304, line 26) communicates himself. The Responsory of the Bema now being finished, the deacon cries "Bless, O my Lord," and the priest lifts up his hand and makes the sign of the cross over the people saying in an audible voice, "The gift of the grace of our lifegiver our Lord Jesus Christ be accomplished in mercies with us all," to which they answer "For ever and ever. Amen." (298). During the Communion of the clergy and people a responsory, consisting of theme and verses, is sung by deacons or subdeacons in the sanctuary and may be answered by those in the bema (299, lines 12 ff), and if the Communion be prolonged other verses as well. The priest carries the paten in both his hands and turns towards the presbyters and deacons standing before the altar and wearing stoles and puts a particle into the mouth of each, saying "The Body of our Lord to the modest priest (deacon of God) for pardon of offences." He then returns to the altar, places the paten on it, takes the chalice in his right hand and communicates each saying "The precious Blood of our Lord to the modest priest (deacon of God) for pardon of offences" or "Spiritual banquet for life eternal" (298).¹ He then goes down to the door of the sanctuary or beyond it, preceded by lights, and communicates the people, putting a "coal" in the mouth of each and saying "The Body of our Lord to the pious believer for pardon of offences." The clergy and people receive standing.

Towards the end of the Communion is sung, very quickly, the teshbohta ("praise" or canticle) of thanksgiving, of ecclesiastical composition (299—301), and the priest returns the paten to the altar, and as he goes up the deacon proclaims "Let us all, therefore, who, by the gift of the grace of the Holy Ghost, have drawn near and have been accounted worthy and have partaken in the reception of these glorious and holy and lifegiving and divine Mysteries, give thanks together and glorify God who gave them," and the people answer "Glory to him for his unspeakable gift" (301). The deacon then says "Let us pray. Peace be with us," and the priest says aloud two Prayers of Thanksgiving (302). This is followed

¹ In practice presbyters present only communicate from the chalice on Maundy Thursday, and deacons on the day of their ordination.

by the Lord's Prayer said aloud as in the beginning, namely, "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come. Holy, holy, holy art thou. . . . Our Father who art in heaven. . . . Holy, holy, holy art thou," with "Bless, O my Lord," at the end.

The priest now comes to the door of the sanctuary and standing with his face towards the people blesses them, saying in an audible voice the hutama or "seal" (303—4).

The ablutions¹ accompanied by three prayers (304—5) follow. The priest consumes what remains of the Blessed Sacrament if there be no tabernacle (beth qurbana, "house of the oblation.") He then transfers the fragments on the paten to the chalice, drinks wine poured into the chalice, and washes his fingers over the chalice with wine and water which he drinks. The deacon may now pour water over the paten ; if so, the priest purifies it, pours the water into the chalice and drinks it. He then wipes with the purificator (m'khap ranitha) his fingers, the paten and the chalice, arranges the vessels, and descends with them saying the "seal" (305), and goes to the diaconicon.

(To be concluded)

H. W. CODRINGTON.

¹ In practice the priest begins the ablutions during "Let us all, therefore." If he has not finished them by the end of this proclamation, he completes them after the "Seal." The prayers are said in their proper place as given above. "La Messa Caldea" gives them for the passage from the altar to the sacristy.

THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS MISSION

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following account is written from the Ukrainian point of view. There are certain statements made and views advocated which some people would quite legitimately question while at the same time admitting that the Ukrainians had been very badly treated.

In regard to point 7 of the Congress resolution, it is to be hoped that the movement in favour of a return to the *pure rite* advocated by the Metropolitan Szeptycky and the Studite monks will have grown stronger among the Ukrainian clergy at large before they have anything to do with the Orthodox in Poland. Indeed, we doubt if Rome would otherwise be keen on their activities outside Galicia.

Certain Ukrainian *uses* in the Liturgy going back to before the time of the Patriarch Nikon of Moscow (XVIIth century) are allowable, but it is the Western outlook of so many of the clergy that is regrettable. It may be remembered in this connection that Mgr. Czarnecky, the much hampered Catholic Byzantine bishop in Poland, is himself a Ukrainian but has abandoned the Ukrainian use, which, by the way, is properly called *Ruthenian* in ecclesiastical terminology.

UKRAINIAN Catholics belong to that group of the Eastern churches which comes under the heading "Byzantine rite." This rite is subdivided according to the nationalities which belong to it, the most numerous of which are the Ukrainians (referred to ecclesiastically as Ruthenians).

There are some 6,600,000 Ukrainian Catholics, who live chiefly in Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, the U.S.A. and Canada.

In the eighteenth century the majority of Ukrainians (not counting those within the boundaries of the Russian empire) belonged to the Catholic Church, and their number, according to the historian Theiner, reached from ten to twelve million. Their numbers were reduced considerably by the religious persecution adopted by Catherine II. Deportations and physical compulsion often resulting in death were the common methods used for "converting" the Ukrainian Catholics to the Russian State religion.

The whole history of this branch of the Eastern church is one of continuous suffering and martyrdom. The eighteenth century, however, brought relief to those Catholic Ukrainians inhabiting the ancient kingdom of Halych, which had been held by the Polish kings since 1340. In 1772 this part of Ukraine was annexed by Austria and its church was gradually put on an equal footing with the Latin church.

Several centuries of Polish rule had reduced Ukrainians to serfs and only a sprinkling of the former numerous and powerful Ukrainian nobility remained true to their rite.

Some abandoned not only their rite but also their nationality. The Ukrainian church in Poland became the church of the poorest of the poor—the serfs. The village clergy hardly differed from their parishioners. Oppressed and desperately poor they lived much the same life as the peasants, whose joys and sorrows they intimately shared. Their sons and daughters often intermarried with peasants. The parish priests very often were compelled by their Polish landlords to render the same compulsory work for the manor as the serfs. Common life and common interests created a strong bond between the priest and his flock which lasted well into the nineteenth century and even until the present day. The parish priest was always in close contact with the people; he belonged to them and he was one of them. “For the Ukrainians, the Church did not become an external and superior force whose sanctions sanctified the nation (as was the case in Muscovite Russia), it was a national function of the nation and an individual attribute of it . . .” says Mirsky in his book *Russia: A Social History*, p. 80. The difficult conditions under which the Ukrainian Catholic church had to live during the eighteenth century made it a national church. Both from Orthodox Russia and Catholic Poland it suffered oppression and degradation. The Polish historian, Tadeusz Korzon, describes the conditions of the Ukrainian church in Poland shortly before the Partitions, as follows: “United with the Roman church in article of faith and rites, recognizing as their spiritual head the Pope, it seems they should have enjoyed complete equality with the Catholics. But, unfortunately, this was not the case. They were kept back in order that the Roman Catholic clergy might be elevated. The uniate clergy had very meagre incomes, and added to this, the nobility did not trust them and suspected them of leanings towards the schismatic faith and of inciting the peasants to revolt. . . .” (Tadeusz Korzon: *Wewnętrzne dzieje za Stanisława Augusta*, p. 225).

But even after Austrian occupation it took some time before there was an improvement. Complaints poured into Rome and Vienna. On 17th July, 1774, Bishop Leo Szeptycky sent his second petition to Vienna enumerating all the grievances of the Ukrainians and their church, not omitting to emphasize that the Ukrainian clergy were scoffed at by the Polish clergy who refused to regard them as true Catholics and called their churches synagogues, etc. The bishop also complained in this petition to the throne that the Ukrainians were hindered in the observances of their religious rites by petty persecutions, such as prohibitions of the ringing of bells on their holidays and forcing them to break their fast

on fast-days, etc. (*Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* by Dr. Julian Pelesz, Vol. II, p. 646).

But the humiliation and persecutions suffered in Poland and during the first years of Austrian rule were mere trifles when compared with the measures adopted by Catherine II, notwithstanding the pledges and solemn guarantees she had given to tolerate the religious feelings of the population of the provinces taken over by Russia during the Partitions of Poland in 1772—1796. No sooner was the country occupied when the government embarked on a policy of “converting” the Ukrainian Catholics. Many were banished to Siberia, many clergy were imprisoned and much brutal force was employed. In a few decades of such treatment, Catherine II could boast of having “converted” eight million Ukrainians to Orthodoxy and had abolished 9,316 Ukrainian Catholic parish churches and 145 monasteries.

The union was finally abolished in Russia in 1875, the last Ukrainian Catholic priests escaping to Austria to seek refuge.

The ukase issued after the Russian revolution of 1905 concerning toleration eased the situation but it did not affect the Ukrainian Catholics. Their priests, as before, were not allowed to enter Russia, and if any such priest wished to visit a Russian province he could only do so under an assumed name.

In contrast to this, in Austria they were allowed to develop freely: and towards the end of the eighteenth century, due to the energy of its leaders, the whole church was reorganized. Excellent theological seminaries were established in Vienna and Lemberg, the metropolitan see of Halych was re-established in 1808, and the second metropolitan and archbishop, Mgr. Michael Levitsky, was made a cardinal in 1856.

The Ukrainian Catholics were again challenged when, at the beginning of the World War, Galicia was occupied by the Russian armies. Pledges for tolerance in religious matters were published by the high command, but history repeated itself in almost every detail.

The first blow was felt by the head of the church, Metropolitan Szeptycky. He did not leave the country but remained with his flock. He was not at liberty for long, however, for on 19th September, 1914, he was arrested by order of the Russian high command and deported into the interior of Russia where he remained until the revolution of 1917 when he obtained his freedom.

“I was thrown into a monastic prison in Susdal, a place destined for those convicted of crimes against the Church and religion. When this became known in more liberal

Russian circles, they protested against a bishop of a foreign church being confined in such a place. The author Korolenko took up the matter in the press, and as a result of his articles I was transferred from Susdal o/Klazma to Yaroslavl o/Volga where I was put in a private house specially rented for the purpose and consisting of five almost bare rooms. It was guarded by uniformed police and detectives. . . . ”

(*Freedom and Expectations*, Dilo, 7th March, 1937)

In 1917 the proclamation of the Ukrainian republic brought his release. Religious persecutions ceased immediately and all banished priests were allowed to return home. Metropolitan Szeptycky on his return was met in triumph by the whole Ukrainian population, Orthodox and Catholic alike. In Kiev he was received with honours equal to those of a sovereign. During his short stay there he learnt with what great sympathy the idea of union was met by the Ukrainians and his hopes were further raised by the warm support given by the members of the newly-constituted independent Ukrainian government. “No wonder,” writes the Metropolitan in his reminiscences of those times, “that great hopes have been raised by events. These hopes have been shattered (with the advent of the Bolsheviks—Ed.) but I sincerely trust that they will revive. They have not disappeared but only been delayed.”

In September 1914, soon after the arrest of the Metropolitan, the Russian Orthodox holy synod determined to try to bring the Ukrainian Catholics of Austria into their fold. Archbishop Eulogius was entrusted with this task but the Orthodox authorities were misinformed regarding popular sentiment and the “conversion” was resisted by the whole population; so much so that the military high command became alarmed and remonstrated against such action.

The following figures will show how this “conversion” was conducted. By April 15th, 1915, 113 Orthodox parishes had been created in Galicia; and in a very short time before the retreat of the Russian armies their number was doubled. Most of these parishes disappeared immediately the 1917 revolution broke out, and the idea of union became once again predominant.

On his way back from exile in April 1917, Metropolitan Szeptycky visited Petrograd and appointed Mgr. Leonide Fiodorov (returned from Siberia where the Czarist government had exiled him) exarch for all Catholics of the Byzantine rite in Russian territory. His appointment was confirmed by an official document issued and signed, on the request of

Metropolitan Szeptycky, by the head of the Provisional Government, Prince Lwow. Now, for the first time, the Catholic Byzantine church became legalized in Russia and was allowed free development. This freedom, however, was short-lived. With the advent of the Bolsheviki, Mgr. Fiodorov was again banished to the northern regions, where he died on 7th March, 1935.

The old idea, which was noticeable during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—the desire to link up the Ukraine with the West—was shattered by the occupation of the Ukraine by the Bolsheviki, the establishment of a soviet regime, with its persecution of the Church, and finally with its wholesale starvation of the population in the years 1932—3, when millions of peasants perished of hunger.

Galicia, on the other hand, was occupied by the Polish army, and after some time the Council of Ambassadors gave it to Poland (1923) under the condition that the Ukrainians were given some measure of autonomy (which has never been done). A concordat concluded between Poland and the Vatican regulated the affairs of the Ukrainian Catholic church in Poland. Again it became the religion of a second-rank nation—viewed with suspicion as being too closely linked with the people and too distinct to be convenient.

On December 22nd, 1936, the whole Ukrainian Catholic church celebrated with great solemnity the 300th anniversary of the death of one of their greatest religious leaders, the Metropolitan Joseph Velamin Rutsky (1614—1637).

On the last day of this congress a resolution was adopted, some points of which are of general interest. It was suggested that the mission of this branch of the Eastern Catholic church is not yet fulfilled, and, given the right conditions in eastern Europe, it may be called upon to perform a great task.

The first point of the resolution states: "The Ukrainian Catholic church will diligently remember that it belongs to the Eastern church in union with the Apostolic See, and will preserve and cherish its eastern traditions. To the non-united churches it should become an example and should attract and pave the way to attain the blessings and the glory of the Holy Ghost."

Point 2. "The Catholic church of the Eastern rite had suited best the mentality of the Ukrainian people, and in the future will be able to lift the whole Ukrainian nation from the religious and moral ruin in which it fell during those disastrous years of godlessness and oppression in the Ukraine."

Point 3. "The Eastern character of the Ukrainian Catholic church as concerns its government, its rite and church discipline, should be based on the old Ukrainian traditions, especially on the heroic epoch during the reign of Metropolitan Rutsky."

Point 4. "All ideas as expressed by the Metropolitan Rutsky, such as the idea of a patriarchate of Kiev, etc., are useful for the furthering of the cause of Ukrainian Catholicism."

Point 5. "The congress stresses the need to defend all the rights of the metropolitans of Halych, the successors of famous traditions of the Kiev-Halych metropolitans, because the traditional office of the metropolitan has always been the foundation of the unity and power of the Ukrainian Catholic church."

Point 7. "The assembled members of the congress state that the Ukrainian Catholic clergy of Galicia, being of a related rite¹ and the same nationality as the members of the *non-united* church in Poland, are in the first place called upon for work for the Union of their co-nationals; therefore the congress expresses deep regret that these clergy have been barred from the work for union amongst their brethren, and turn to the Apostolic See with most sincere requests that for the sake of success of the work amongst the *non-united* brethren, the following should be allowed:—

1. That the Ukrainian Catholic clergy should be allowed to work for the union in those territories of Poland inhabited by the *non-united* population;
2. That a separate hierarchy of the Byzantine-Slav rite should be established for the benefit of those who are in Union with Rome, and that the whole territory embraced by the action of the Union should be put under its jurisdiction."

The above are some of the main resolutions adopted by the congress. They point to a curious state of affairs in Catholic Poland, *viz.*, that the government does not permit the Ukrainian Catholic clergy to propagate union with Rome amongst the Ukrainians of the Orthodox faith and even bars them from entering the provinces inhabited by Orthodox Ukrainians.

V. J. KISILEWSKY.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

We call the attention of our readers in the U.S.A. to the fact that Mr. Kane is again kindly undertaking the work of E.C.Q. agent in New York.

Those who have had during this year dealings with Mr. Coldwell direct will of course receive this year's issue from London. But in future it will help all concerned if the U.S.A. subscribers will write direct to Mr. James E. Kane, 804, West 180 Street, New York.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS "PRO ORIENTE CHRISTIANO."

At the beginning of May, the Italian Association *pro Oriente christiano* held its first International Congress in Rome. The organisation of the congress, which was wonderfully successful, especially for a first attempt, was almost entirely due to the Very Rev. Fathers Herman and Gordillo, President and Vice-President of the Pontifical Oriental Institute. Repre-

¹ The same rite with minor variations.—ED.

sentatives of similar associations or of reviews and other periodicals were present from France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Greece. The only Orthodox prelate present was the most Rev. Archimandrite Ilkic from Yougoslavia, editor of the *Dukhovna Straza*. The EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY was represented by Edward Bowron, Esq., and Don R. Pilkington of Florence.

The Congress opened with a solemn Liturgy on Sunday, May 2nd, feast of St. Athanasius, in the church of the Greek College. It was celebrated by H.E. Mgr. A. Evreinoff, a Russian bishop living in Rome, and by five other priests in the presence of H.E. Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Oriental Congregation. The singing by the seminarists of the College was broadcast by the Roman station. In the evening, in the great hall of the Catholic Press Exhibition at the Vatican, was held the opening meeting, at which the President of the Italian Association, Cardinal Lavitrano, Archbishop of Palermo, made a moving inaugural speech. After insisting on the need of prayer for reunion, he said to prayer must be joined a preparation of knowledge of the East, of its conditions, of its spirit. "We will remain divided till the thick veil falls of misunderstandings and prejudices. . . The Church, the Spouse of Christ, and jealous guardian of the treasures of His infinite love, knows well that if our separated brethren stand in need of light, they stand in greater need of love." H.E. Mgr. Mimmi, Archbishop of Bari and Vice-President of the Association, then made his great speech. "Never before, perhaps," he said, "has the human race been so united as it is to-day; never before has it been so disunited" —united physically by the wonderful means of communication we have at our disposal, disunited morally by hatred and jealousy. "If the hordes of Islam could once compel separated churches to unite, why should not the no less menacing hordes of atheist materialist communism bring them together again? . . . The world would behold the wonderful sight, unique in history, of over 500 million men scattered all over the earth, forming one family, walking in the light of the same faith, drinking at the same fountain of life, moving at the beckoning of the same Head. . . Nor let it be feared that union with Rome would bring about a levelling down and a constraint of the various peoples at the expense of legitimate national feeling, because the Church, while remaining substantially one, and everywhere and always the same in doctrine, in moral teaching and in government, knows how to adapt herself in a wonderful way to the character, traditions, usages and customs of every people."

The meetings on Monday and Tuesday were held morning and afternoon in the library of the Oriental Institute. The first paper was read by the Assumptionist Father Salaville, spiritual director of the Roumanian College, on the Apostolate for the Christian East by means of periodicals and reviews. Due mention was made of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY. Don R. Pilkington, regional delegate for Tuscany, read a paper on the Apostolate by means of study circles and associations. Someone suggested that this Apostolate should be entrusted to the missionary section of the "Catholic Action," but it was declared that the Sovereign Pontiff had expressly forbidden this procedure, which would seem to put the dissident churches on the same footing as the heathen. Next day Mgr. Panciera, regional delegate for the Veneto, spoke of the Apostolate amongst the clergy and in seminaries, and in the afternoon Mgr. A. Sipiaghin, a professor at the Oriental Institute, traced a programme of Apostolate amongst the faithful by means of lectures, liturgical celebrations, etc.

The whole congress passed off in a delightful atmosphere of harmony, good will and broadmindedness. There was hardly any discussion, but a great deal of time was taken up with the detailed accounts by delegates of the activity of their own associations and organisations. The only point raised which caused some controversy was the insistence of one member on the desirability of individual conversions of dissidents. Other speakers immediately pointed out that the aim in view was rather to prepare the way for the reunion of entire Churches and not to separate the faithful from their pastors.

At the last meeting it was decided, if the Oriental Congregation so approved, to institute a permanent international council in Rome "pro Oriente christiano" which should direct the various national or regional associations, publications, etc., and for this purpose should itself publish a periodical leaflet.

On the morning of May 5th, the congress was received in audience by H.E. Cardinal Tisserant, who promised that the Oriental Congregation would give the fullest attention to all the desires that had been expressed. He recommended very specially in studying the Eastern question, complete sincerity and the most accurate precision. One might be tempted when speaking of dissident churches to pass over or attenuate certain differences between them and ourselves with the idea of making reunion more easy. But this might lead to regrettable surprises. Charity must not offend the truth.

The final act of the congress was to transport itself bodily

to Castel Gandolfo to be received in audience by the Pope. The Holy Father made us an encouraging speech and solemnly blessed us. It was a joy to see the Orthodox Archimandrite Ilikic with all his insignia seated with the Catholic bishops around the Pope. Next time may there be several others with him!

THE ECUMENICAL DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

This is a most excellent setting forth of the traditional teaching of the Christian East on the Eucharistic Presence by the Rev. Herbert Rees, a minor Canon of St. Paul's in *Sobornost*.

In this article it is shown how the terminology used by the Greek Fathers—(St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. John Chrysostom as examples of early period) gradually became more defined during the course of centuries (St. John Damascene, St. Nicephorus and St. Theodore the Studite representing the period of the Iconoclastic heresy) and that the teaching of seventeenth century Orthodox Symbolic books is simply carrying on the doctrine of these Fathers in regard to the real objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. He concludes by showing that this tradition is quite in keeping with the teaching of the Council of Trent.

This article, coming from the Anglican side at the present time when the Eucharistic Doctrine is being examined by Orthodox and Anglicans alike, is important. We advise our readers to get this number of *Sobornost* and study it. (*Sobornost*, March, 1937. 1s. 6d. Annandale, North End Road, N.W. 11).

THE SCOTO-RUSSIAN FELLOWSHIP OF ST. ANDREW.

This Fellowship has only just been founded, we presume as the result of the four one-day conferences given at the end of last year at Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrews and Aberdeen. The Russian party at those conferences were Fr. Florovsky, Professor Zander, Dr. Zenov and Miss Irina Doroshevsky.

The present Scottish committee consists of some eleven ministers of the Church of Scotland and three members of the laity under the presidentship of Dr. Charles Warr of St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh.

"This Fellowship has been founded to promote friendship and understanding between members of the Church of Scot-

land and of the Russian Orthodox Church, and to claim a small share in the privilege of helping to maintain in Paris the sole remaining Theological College now left to that once great Church, and the work of the Russian Student Christian Movement among the Russian exiles in Europe." So runs their official leaflet. One note of comment here, it is not accurate to speak of the Institute of the Rue Crimée as the sole remaining Theological College of the Russian Church, there is also that of St. Kirik's in Bulgaria, and one at Harbin in Manchuria, besides the fact that the education of Russian Orthodox priests is being met by local means in Poland, Latvia, Estonia and elsewhere.

Nevertheless, we look with great interest and hope on the foundation of this Fellowship. Particularly to be noted is the way this will lead the Kirk to an understanding of the essentials of Catholic liturgical worship and also the importance of the intercession of the "glorious Lady, Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary." This the Kirk would never have taken from Rome nor even from the Anglicans—we are told that when Orthodox Vespers (which include prayers to Our Lady) was said in Glasgow Cathedral by the Russians, the Presbyterians joined in while the few Anglicans sat apart! Orthodoxy, we think, alone could have made such a contact in the official circles of the Church of Scotland.

THE SOPHIOLOGICAL DISCUSSION AND FATHER SERGIUS BULGAKOV

All three of our contemporaries—*Irenikon*, *The Christian East*, and *Sobornost*—have something to say about this question. But it is *Irenikon* that gives the most complete account of the subject, Dom Clement Lialine devoting 38 pages to it in the *Chronique Religieuse*.

The arch-priest Sergius Bulgakov is the dean of the Institute of Russian Orthodox Theology in Paris and since the death of the Metropolitan Anthony, the leading theologian in the Russian Church. He took part last November at the first international congress of Orthodox theologians at Athens and is the centre of an enthusiastic following, hence the condemnation of his Sophiological teaching by some of the Russian bishops has provoked much discussion and aroused wide interest in the ideas themselves.

In the following summary of the question, where we make no explicit reference to other sources, our authority is that of the article in *Irenikon* (Mars-Avril, 1936).

First a few biographical details. Father Bulgakov was born of a clerical family on July 16th, 1871, in central Russia.

When he had finished his university studies, he taught political economy at Kiev and Moscow. For a time he became a follower of Marxism but left that for idealism and then, under the influence of the writings of Vladimir Soloviev, he made full profession of the Orthodox faith. But in doing so he was never blind to the human failings of the Russian Orthodox Church.

He became a member of societies of religious philosophy at St. Petersburg and Moscow and a friend of Father Paul Florenskij who published his famous thesis for the master-ship at the ecclesiastical academy of Moscow—*The Pillar and Foundation of Truth*—in 1914 (this book is also Sophiological and at present much discussed). It was in 1917 that Sergius Bulgakov (since he was not yet a priest) brought out his own first Sophiological work, *The Unfading Light*.

In 1918 Father Bulgakov was ordained priest by the Patriarch Tikhon and became a member of the supreme ecclesiastical Council. After being expelled from Moscow he became professor of dogmatic theology at Paris in 1925.

But it was in 1924 that Father Bulgakov's teaching was first called in question by the Metropolitan Anthony in the *Novoe Vremja* of Belgrade; the Metropolitan, however, retracted his statement in another Russian paper, *Vecernee Vremja*, also brought out in Belgrade. It was in order to remove the cloud which had thus been cast over him as a theologian that Father Bulgakov published his work *The Hypostasis and 'Hypostasis,'* in 1925.

Passing over other similar accusations and repudiations we will come to recent happenings. The Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow informed the Metropolitan Eleutherius of Lithuania of the decree of the Patriarchate of 7th September, 1935, which condemned with supporting evidence the teachings of Father Bulgakov. At the same time the Synod of Karlovcy in October 1935, having heard the report of the commission which had studied the same teachings, condemned them and communicated its verdict to the Metropolitan Eulogius with an explanatory letter from the Metropolitan Anthony.

We will summarise the conclusions of Father Bulgakov's reply to the Metropolitan Sergius.

1. He says that the Metropolitan had based his condemnation on an insufficient acquaintance of his works. That he himself had neither been informed of the judgment nor had it been preceded by an examination of competent theologians.
2. He repudiates the term "pagan-gnostic" which had been applied to his conception of the world; declares that he

holds all the dogmas of Orthodoxy ; says that his Sophiology does not concern the content of these dogmas but only their theological interpretation. Also that his teachings are only his personal theological convictions, but claims the right to express them since the Church has always known schools of theological opinion, e.g., those of Alexandria and Antioch.

3. He says that the genuine expression of his Sophiological teaching, as applied to particular questions of dogma, should be studied in his works—*The Unfading Light* (1917), *The Hypostasis and Hypostasity* (1925), then in 1927, *The Burning Bush* on the cult of the Blessed Virgin, and *The Friend of the Bridegroom* on the cult of St. John the Baptist, *Jacob's Ladder* on the Angels (1929), *The Eikon and its Cult* (1931), *The Orthodox Church* (1932) (of which there is an English translation), *The Lamb of God* (1933). From these it will be seen that he is inspired by the Orthodox and Russian manner of venerating the Sophia as expressed in the Liturgy and iconography.
4. He says that the condemnation itself does not correspond to the conciliar spirit of Orthodoxy.

Another reply was sent to the Council of Karlovcy. Quite a number of intellectual leaders have taken up Father Bulgakov's defence : N. Berdyaev, *L'esprit du Grand Inquisiteur* ; G. Fedotov, *A propos des discussions theologiques actuelles* ; J. Lagovskij, *L'expérience dogmatique et les schémes dogmatiques* ; Vladimir Iljin, *La Sophia, Sagesse de Dieu*. On the other hand Professor N. Arseniev gives his general opinion on the question thus : "In this over-subtle Sophiology one no longer finds the true 'concentration' of the Gospels, for it puts on to the stage other very important intermediaries whom one can hardly distinguish from Christ. Nor does one find full catholicity, for the teaching of the Catholic tradition of the ancient Church is no longer regarded as obligatory in important questions regarding the faith." (*Evangelische Katholizität in der Ostkirche. Eine Heilige Kirche. Sonderheft vom Fortschritt der evangelischen Katholizität, 1936, January—February.*) Also we gather that Father G. Florovsky (of the Paris Academy) is not in agreement with Father Bulgakov as to the significance of the eikon of the Holy Wisdom of Novgorod (*De la vénération de la Sophia-Sagesse de Dieu à Byzance et en Russie, 1932*).

From a canonical point of view it should be remembered that Father Bulgakov is under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Eulogius of Paris, who is exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Neither of these authorities has condemned him.

We will now give a summary of the judgment passed on Father Bulgakov in *Irenikon* :—

That although in Theodicy, Sophiology does not introduce a fourth hypostasis into the Trinity, yet Father Bulgakov's concrete philosophy lays itself open to Archbishop Seraphim's accusation of dividing the Divinity. (In his *The new teaching on the Sophia, the Wisdom of God*. Sophia, 1935.)

That his teaching can only lay claim to being "traditional" if one includes in Tradition the philosophico-religious and cultural tendencies of the Christian East. (Reference is made to Professor L. H. Grondij's *De Sophia—Gedachte in het Russisch Christendom*, Amsterdam, Paris, 1932.)

That Father Bulgakov gives philosophy a certain predominance over theology. That he is inclined to measure the argument from the authority of the Fathers in accordance with how they conform or do not conform with Sophiology. And that in general he does not seem to bother to penetrate deeply into the systems opposed to his own, yet it must be said in his favour that the condemnations brought against him are based on an insufficiency of information.

The article concludes by wishing that the discussion about the Sophia should spread (so far the theologians of the other Orthodox Churches have taken no part in the question), since it would be a proof of the vitality of the theological thought in the Orthodox Church and also bring to the fore the following problems :—

- " 1. The liberty of the Orthodox theologian in his speculations. What authority can determine it?
- " 2. The connected problem of the relation between theology and faith.
- " 3. An Orthodox conception of Tradition.
- " 4. Theological method.
- " 5. The value of the argument from the Fathers.
- " 6. The relations of theology and philosophy. (N. Berdyaev in his article rightly asks : What is the philosophy which the Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow would admit in theology? ")

Certainly the whole Sophiological question is not one of Modernism in the *Western* acceptation of the word ; it is rather a religious philosophy worthy of interest and study. To quote *Blackfriars* (May, 1937), in commenting on the article of Mr. Rayner Heppenstall, *The Re-born Church of Sophia* (published in *Christendom*)—" The task of synthesizing Eastern 'theosophy' with Western 'theology' is one of the most important that confronts us."

In our present issue and in that of April the problem is somewhat discussed in so far as it concerns Vladimir Soloviev. One would like to see the teaching of the Fathers about the Sophia treated of in a monograph. The Fathers, however, should be read in the light of the theological tradition of their own period and not in that of an idealistic philosophy.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DEAR REV. FATHER,

Having read in the English Catholic Press so many laudatory opinions of Mlle. Danzas' book, *The Russian Church*, which I suppose is a translation of *L'itinéraire de la conscience russe*, Collection *Istina*, I think it would be interesting to offer in English to those interested in Christian Reunion the judgment formed by M. Nicholas Berdyaev on the work. The original is to be found in *Put* (Paris), No. 51, May-October, 1936, p. 74.

"This work gives a short study of the history of Russian religious sentiment and Russian religious thought. Its scope is too wide for the modest size of the book. The book is cleverly written, and with an external knowledge of the subject, but it is very tendentious and gives an inaccurate picture in which the general perspective is distorted to conform to the author's ideas. The author is a Russian Catholic who has suffered on Solovki for her religious convictions, and the whole book is penetrated by the peculiar spirit of Russian Catholicism with its missionary aims. The impression is inescapable that the book has been written by a foreigner, to whom Russia and everything Russian is absolutely foreign, and who writes as one outside, from a distance—like someone who, proud of belonging to civilization, tells of his visit to some barbarous country. There is the same unpleasant tone of lofty contempt. Too often in the time of Peter the Great this was the attitude towards the Russian people of those Russian nobles who had adopted western civilization. Firmly established in her Catholicism Mlle. Danzas possesses great self-confidence, quietness and happiness. This is not the case with the western Catholics themselves, who, notwithstanding the optimism of the official Thomistic theology, are compelled to sense the tragedy of the position and can no longer continue in peace. The reading of Mlle. Danzas' book can leave the impression, that, thanks to Catholicism, Western Europe is completely happy and cannot permit itself any of those foolishnesses which Russia allows, unenlightened by the Truth of the Catholic Church. But, as a matter of fact, Western Europe, as indeed the whole world, is encircled by fire and the ground is shaking beneath it. Mlle. Danzas' point of view is too provincially Russian Catholic. Catholicism did not safeguard Western Europe from the Reformation, from the French Revolution, from the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, from Marx and Nietzsche, from religious indifferentism and from active atheism and hostility towards Christianity.

"It is astounding to see how utterly foreign to the author are all the Russian traditions, how completely she fails to love any of those things in which the Russian genius has found clearest expression. To her Dostoyevsky, Leo Tolstoy and the Russian longing for social truth are all unintelligible and unpleasant. Mlle. Danzas has adopted the point of view, already expressed by Catholic writers, that in Russian Orthodoxy there is a strong dualistic, Manicheistic element. She sees this especially

in Dostoyevsky, although in the very centre of Dostoyevsky's work stands the idea of liberty, an idea entirely foreign to Manicheism. This point of view leads the author into contradictions. On the one side, Manicheistic dualism denying the world as immersed in evil and placed in the power of the devil, on the other side Russian tolerance of evil and the wicked, a tolerance which especially troubles the moral nature of Mlle. Danzas. The Manicheistic, dualistic element can be found in the whole monastic and ascetic conception, more particularly in the Syrian asceticism, but also in the West. This element has never vanished from historic Christianity. Most free from it was St. Thomas Aquinas, who had a weakened sense of sin and evil and the only dualism remaining is between the natural and the supernatural. In the case of the Blessed Augustine, who was not a Russian, Manicheistic dualism remained a strong influence even after he had become the enemy of Manicheism. But the tolerant and compassionate attitude of the Russian people towards sinners and the wicked is directly opposed to the dualistic division into kingdom of light and kingdom of darkness—and this attitude is of evangelical origin. This has been the most Christian trait in the Russian people. On the contrary, Russian religious thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is accused of a too great acceptance of the cosmos, which is represented as penetrated by divine energies. Orthodoxy is more cosmic than Catholicism, in it the idea of the enlightenment and of the transfiguration of the creature and of the Resurrection occupies a central place. But Russian Orthodoxy is a complicated structure; in it are several elements: monastic and ascetic, Byzantine in origin; cosmic, devoted to the sanctification and enlightenment of the creature, with which are combined popular religious sentiment and the sophiology of the religious *Intelligentsia*; and the historiosophic eschatological, devoted to the seeking of the Kingdom of God. Mlle. Danzas does not distinguish these elements. . . . Official ecclesiasticism, which Mlle. Danzas rightly castigates, is for her more important and more interesting than the Russian saints, 'startsy,' than the authentic spiritual life.

"Mlle. Danzas does not understand Russian religious philosophy, its problematic is completely foreign to her. From the point of view of her conservative Catholicism she cannot admit any new problematic in religious life. Especially striking is her failure to understand Chomyakov, who is most antipathetic to Catholics, and the inaccurate exposition of Slavophilism. . . . The Slavophiles prove to be Protestants. The possibility of any theological speculation other than either Catholic or Protestant is not admitted. In the original Russian religio-philosophical thought of the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, Mlle. Danzas sees Gnosticism, in which she agrees with the accusations of obscurantist Orthodox circles. In reality every religious philosophy can be called Gnosticism. Seminary theology alone is not Gnostic, but for that reason it is also entirely lacking in creative thought. In any case, Russian religio-philosophical thought does not possess any points of contact with the Gnostics of the first centuries of Christianity and it is impossible to find any influence here. The whole problematic is different. This thought passed through the experience of humanism, unknown to the old Gnostics, through the acute stating of the problem of man and culture. . . . It is true that Catholicism was badly known amongst us and that we were unjust towards it. With absolute justice Mlle. Danzas criticizes the slavish and shameful dependence of the Orthodox Church on the state and the extreme nationalization of the ecclesiastical conscience, the weakening of the consciousness of universality. It is also true that "obrjadoverie" (identification of rite and faith) and ritualism played too great a rôle in Russian Orthodoxy especially in the Muscovite period which Mlle. Danzas mistakenly considers the most important in the history of the Russian Church. One reads the little work with interest, but one must always keep before one the aim which the author assigned herself—propaganda on behalf of Catholicism for

Russia as the only saving force. One must remark, however, that this aim is so hopeless and so fails to suit the requirements of our age, that it does not offer the slightest danger."

If Catholicism be taken in the way Mlle. Danzas authorizes Berdyaev to take it, I think there could be no better retort.

Yours sincerely,

A RUSSIAN WORKER FOR REUNION.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Mystical Christ. By John C. Gruden, S.T.L. (B. Herder Book Co.) 12s. 6d.

One of those books, like Abbot Vonier's *Key to the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, which not only flood the soul with light as one reads them but illuminate all other reading thereafter.

The sub-title of the treatise is *An Introduction to the Study of the Supernatural Character of the Church*, and Fr. Gruden's thesis is that the most exact concept of the Church is the one found in the New Testament, repeated continually in the writings of the Fathers, and still expressed in the Liturgy, that pure mirror of Catholic truth and Catholic life, namely, that the Church is the body of Christ.

While emphasising the importance of the external congregation of all the faithful under one head, the author shows the dangers, in the light of modernistic and materialistic tendencies, of not stressing rather the vivifying principle, that communication of the Holy Spirit whereby its members form a living organism, not merely an organization.

The thesis is, of course, a familiar one and formed part of the official *schema* for the Vatican Council, but nowhere has it received such clear and exhaustive treatment as in the 325 pages before us. Where all is so excellent, it is difficult to know which points are most deserving of emphasis, but, to take the Scriptural exegesis alone, the explanations in the light of the mystical body of such texts as: "I fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is the Church," and "Outside the Church there is no salvation" are the most compelling in their lucidity that we have seen, while the masterly handling of St. John's words on the Light and Life of the world lead inevitably to the final prayer for unity, "that all may be one, even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they too may be in us."

If only we would stop and think, what a wealth of theological significance lies behind St. Paul's instruction to his recently converted Corinthians to refrain from anything that might desecrate their Bodies (as well as their souls) since they are members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit.

How naturally too the sacramental system falls into its place, containing, not mere symbols of a supernatural reality, but visible channels of an invisible life more real than any reality perceptible by the senses. As one reads, it seems impossible that any one could fail to see the connection between these life-giving channels and the sap of the True Vine which vivifies the branches.

This is a book which no one can afford to be without who is even dimly conscious of the heritage into which he has been born, and least of all anyone who feels the longing to make known the full reality to those who with touching fidelity are striving to hand on intact the partial glimpse that has been transmitted to them by their ancestors.

R.J.S.

S.P.C.K.

Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Thought. By Frank Gavin, Th.D. pp. 430. 10s.

This is photographically reproduced from the first edition of 1923.

Dr. Gavin is a well-known clergyman of the American Episcopal Church and as a representative of that Church was an Assessor to the Church of England Delegation at Bucharest in 1935. He has himself studied under that outstanding Greek theologian, the late Christos Androustos, at Athens, so he can lay claim to be somewhat of an authority.

The book covers the whole ground of theological teaching, the main divisions being:—*Prolegomena*; *The Doctrine of God*; *Sin and Salvation*; *The Doctrine of Grace and of the Church*; *The Doctrine of the Sacraments*; and *The Last Things*.

Apart from collecting and editing his material, Dr. Gavin lets the Greek theologians speak for themselves, hence the reader really has a book of first hand information. And outside of the work of these modern Orthodox theologians, reference is often made to the Decrees and Definitions of the seven Œcumenical Councils, the Symbolic Books and the works of the Fathers but especially of St. John Damascene. Also the Greek editions of some of the (not recent) Russian theologians (*e.g.*, Macarius of Moscow) are quoted with occasional references to Catholic authorities (*e.g.*, A. Palmieri), which shows a knowledge of Latin Patristic and scholastic thought. The whole work is set out with great impartiality.

The following extracts from Dr. Gavin's preface will give us an insight into the worth of the book. Speaking of these Greek theologians he says: "The intrinsic worth of some of the writers of this school is such that any company of modern scholars would gladly and gratefully admit them to their fellowship." . . . "All of them are 'modern' in their point of view, alive to present-day difficulties, keenly interested in the progress of European scholarship, broad in the horizon of their sympathies, and utterly antagonistic to narrow insularity, complacency, and to the position called 'obscurantist.'"

It is interesting to note that most of these Greeks owe much to their education in German universities, which can also be said of many of the modern Russian theologians, and yet it is quite clear that they form two distinct schools of Orthodox theology.

The book should be read for its own sake by all interested in the question of the Eastern Churches. But in view of the future international congresses of Orthodox theologians and the present close relations of Anglicans with the Orthodox in Rumania and elsewhere, and also as a counter-balance to the fairly frequent translations of Russian philosophical and theological books into English, the book is invaluable.

B.W.

Origen on the First Principles. By G. W. Butterworth, Litt.D. pp. xlii—334. 12s. 6d.

This book is a new translation of one of Origen's greatest works. The translation has been made from the standard edition of Dr. Paul Koetschau in the series "Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte." The translation is preceded by an introduction and a well selected bibliography which shows that the translation is a work of maturity. The *First Principles* were written not later than A.D. 225 (p. viii), and were the main sources out of which the often narrow-minded critics of Origen drew the subject-matter of their criticism. Consequently, the author rightly judged it profitable to give an outline of the quarrel, named Origenism, which was mainly the outcome, not of Origen's "heresies," but of the regrettable controversies between Jerome and Rufinus. One of the saddest features in Church history is that Origen should thus be made the victim of a strongly personal dispute between two disciples of whom neither was of a stature to gauge the height of the Master. It may be that it was reserved to our days to recognize the true lasting value of Origen's genius. Therefore the contribution of Dr. Butterworth is very timely indeed. His

translation is on the whole exact and very readable. Anyone who has frequented the Master of Alexandria understands with gratitude what a gigantic effort Dr. Butterworth has made. It would be splitting hairs to try to discover a weak expression: a translation will always remain a translation. There are only two things we should like to add. The first is that Origen's use of many terms implies a concrete, physical, dynamic meaning which cannot possibly be rendered in the diluted way modern language treat spiritual realities. Thus, very often, it is necessary to add the original Greek word to the translation. This Dr. Butterworth has not done. The second thing is that we sincerely hope he will do this in the translation of a work where Origen is far more genuine even than in the *Principles*, namely: the *Commentary on St. John*. Such a work surely would not do less honour to the Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

T.W.

Moscow the Third Rome. By Nicolas Zernov, D.Phil. pp. 94. 2s. 6d.

We are very pleased that these lectures of Dr. Zernov have been published in book form (they have already appeared in *The Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1935; January, 1936; July, 1936). They come at a very opportune time, at a time when general religious thought in England and Scotland is being turned with increasing interest towards the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

"Although Russia was Christianised by the Greeks, and her Church has always remained in communion with the rest of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, she has always followed her own path, interpreting for herself the common traditions of Christianity. Indeed, the Greek and the Russian approaches to Christianity are in some points no less divergent than those of the Greek and Latin." So is the work introduced.

The book is divided into:—*From Kiev to Moscow* (988—1480); *The Triumph of Moscow* (1480—1598); *The Fall of Moscow* (1598—1725); *Russia's Religious Destiny*. It is the historical setting out of the theme of the mission of the Russian Church to the rest of Christendom, nay to the rest of the world, as symbolised in the claim of Moscow to be the third Rome.

The author shows that there is discernible under the external complications of Russian history this thread of a Messianic mission. It is largely from its tone, the angle from which events, people and historic facts are viewed, that gives Dr. Zernov's story its value. The way he traces right through

history even up to the present day happenings in Russia, the two parties of the "Possessors" and "Non-possessors," which originated in the rival conceptions of monastic life, is very enlightening, as also his statement that "the decisive factor in the second stage of the revolution of 1917 was not the Communist revolt against the temporary liberal government, but the uprising of the peasants against the educated classes and their Western ideas."

The book should be read by Catholics as a corrective to some of the biased statements in J. N. Danzas's on the whole useful book, *The Russian Church*.

We have been informed by the author himself that reference in his last chapter to the "Roman principles of force and fear" is in no way intended to refer to the Catholic Church as such, or the Popes, but only to the secular side of the Holy Roman Empire. Doubtless in a future edition this will be made clear, since the text as it reads at present is misleading.

B.W.

Annuario Della Associaz. Catholica Italiana per L'Oriente Cristiano, 1936. (Seminario Italo-Albanese, Palermo.) pp. 104.

Inaugurated at the Italo-Albanian Seminary of Palermo in 1931, under the patronage of Cardinal Lavitrano, its President, this Association has so extended as to become really national in scope and activity. The completion of its first five years of life is marked by the Annual for 1936, which includes a chronicle for the period 1928—1936, *i.e.*, from the publication of the *Rerum Orientalium*, and which gives a summary account of Italy's response to the encyclical. The Annual is illustrated with numerous photographs.

P.I.

Bulletin de la Mission Syrienne: Nos. 1—4, 1937. (4 Avenue de Camoens, Paris, 16.)

This bulletin is issued by the Rector of the Syrian Mission in Paris. It is intended primarily as a parochial journal for those Syrian Christians who are now in exile in the French capital.

The first number of the Bulletin (dated December 15th) announces the intention of the Apostolic Nuncio, Mgr. Valeri, of presiding at the solemn Liturgy of the Vigil of Christmas to take place in the Syrian Church at 5 p.m., on December 24th, 1936.

An article on Advent in the Syrian Church shows that for Syrians the fasts and abstinences have, as for Latins, been considerably mitigated in modern times. But all the same "even to-day certain Syrian populations of Mesopotamia or Syria, far from soliciting mitigations of their abstinence, keep up the observance in all its primitive austerity."

The February number contains a letter of January 15th from Cardinal Tappouni, the Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, and the first part of an article on "Ancient Usages concerning the Receiving of the Holy Eucharist." The Syrians themselves to this day receive communion standing, with their arms folded.

The Rector announces the celebration, for the first time in his little church of St. Ephrem, of the office of PADSON. "Obedient to the precept of our Lord, Mother Church invites us to begin the time of Lent . . . by the mutual forgiveness of offences . . . and by the anointing with holy oil."

The parishioners are reminded that the Syrian church in a special manner remembers the dead in her prayers during the three weeks before Lent.

In the March number the long article on primitive modes of receiving Communion is concluded. Among other interesting facts mentioned is the following: "The celebrated abbey of Cluny, which had adopted the use of intinction, and had consequently been among the first to withhold the chalice from the laity, seems to have been one of the last definitely to abandon the Communion under both kinds."

Particulars are given of the Palm Sunday solemnities to be held at St. Ephrem's, and in order that parents may teach their children to take an active part, the Syrian words and the music of the antiphon to be sung in the procession are printed.

In the May issue an article deals with "The Question of Azymes" (use of leavened and unleavened bread in the Eucharist).

A series of liturgical conferences is announced to take place at St. Ephrem's during the Paris International Exhibition. The subjects are: "The Mass of to-day compared with that of the IVth century"; "The Liturgical Year in the Syrian Church"; "The Church in Syria: Schisms and Reunions."

M.G.S.S.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift. 1936.

This quarterly Review edited by several leading members among the Old Catholics is published in Berne, Switzerland. With a view to Reunion it discusses the problems arising out of the divisions in the Church. Although largely devoted

to questions affecting the principal Protestant bodies it has also articles dealing with the Eastern Churches ; notably the essay by P. Bratsiotis on the " State, Nation and Church " from the Orthodox standpoint, which appears in the April number. Reports too are made on the various Eastern activities, *e.g.*, the negotiations between the Orthodox Rumanian Church and the Church of England, as well as the relations existing between the Russian Orthodox and the Anglicans.

G.S.

The Daily Missal. (abridged edition). Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17, Red Lion Passage, London, W.C.1. 4s. 6d.

This is a small edition of the Daily Missal edited by Dom Gaspar Lefebvre of the Abbey of St. André near Bruges. In this abridgment, the Collects, Epistles and Gospels are given in English only, and Vespers and Compline for Sundays and Feasts have been omitted. Thereby a somewhat bulky volume has been reduced to more convenient proportions. For those who do not want a complete Latin text this is probably the ideal missal on account of its sensible arrangement and very full liturgical notes. The new Votive Mass of Jesus Christ the Eternal High Priest is included, and there is a supplement for the dioceses of England and Wales.

The English renderings of the prayers are adequate, but by no means so good as, for instance, those in Abbot Cabrol's well-known Latin-English missal.

M.G.S.S.